

weapon embargoed. Our military experts consider the airplane one of the strongest defensive weapons we have, and our Congress has approved this opinion by appropriating money for one of the largest aerial programs in history.

As I understand, Colonel Lindbergh has approved of this great military program for the defense of our country. Certainly, Colonel Lindbergh, when he gave this advice, did not have in mind that we would use these planes for offensive purposes.

Colonel Lindbergh evidently considers powder an offensive weapon because it is on the embargo list. I cannot conceive how any country could defend itself successfully today without powder and explosives. Colonel Lindbergh evidently does not consider that gasoline and oil are offensive weapons because they are not on the embargo list; and yet the plane which carries the bomb that destroys the lives of innocent people could not operate without gasoline; and the submarine which destroys innocent neutral merchantmen, together with the lives of their seamen on board—without a trace—could not be operated without oil.

Statesmen must strive to be sincere, as well as logical, even in the government of their sentiments.

2. The unrestricted sale of purely defensive armaments: This policy is totally undefined, as becomes evident in the analysis of his No. 1 policy.

3. As to his third policy, that is carried out more strongly in the proposed legislation than was ever before undertaken by this country or any other.

4. As to his fourth policy, the existing law, as well as the proposed law, in accordance with the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States on the Johnson Act, prohibits any credit to belligerent governments, and customary drafts, checks and acceptances are construed as cash.

Colonel Lindbergh says:

I do not believe that repealing the arms embargo would assist democracy in Europe because I do not believe this is a war for democracy.

I do not know what definition Colonel Lindbergh gives to democracies, or what definition he gives to totalitarian powers. There are certainly totalitarian powers in Europe, and there are other powers that are not totalitarian, which are based upon principles of democracy as we understand such principles.

Was Czechoslovakia a democracy? Was Czechoslovakia attempting to defend her democracy, or was Czechoslovakia engaged in power politics?

Was poor Poland mobilizing her forces and attempting to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war for the purpose of power politics or for the purpose of defending her democracy?

Were Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania, through the mobilization of their forces, preparing to defend their form of government, or were such mobilizations for the purpose of power politics?

Germany, before she brought about war against Czechoslovakia and Poland, purchased arms, ammunition, and implements of war from the United States. Was it right to permit a country preparing for war to obtain arms, ammunition, and implements of war; and, when she was prepared, start war, and then prevent her peaceful neighbors from obtaining the same materials for defense by starting war against them?

Are Finland, Norway, and Sweden mobilizing their forces by reason of power politics and a desire for conquest? Is it not evident that they are threatened by conquest, and are seeking to defend their democracies?

Colonel Lindbergh is patriotic, beyond a doubt, yet Colonel Lindbergh sees that the present law injures Great Britain and France, and that its repeal will remove such injury. Apparently he cannot see that the present law not only injures Great Britain and France, but gives great aid to Germany, Italy, and Russia. He cannot see that one of our domestic laws which aids one of the belligerents is unneutral, but he thinks that if we had no law at all that would be unneutral.

The most unfortunate part of Colonel Lindbergh's statement is that it encourages the ideology of the totalitarian gov-

ernments, and is subject to the construction that he approves of their brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon on Monday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until Monday, October 16, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## SENATE

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, hearken, we beseech Thee, to our prayer, as we confess our sins and ask for guidance through the coming hours. Save us from despairing of the age that presses round us with its questions and denials, and help us to find in each perplexity with which we are confronted only the prelude to the coming of the Son of Man with healing in His wings. If we have closed and barred the doors of our understanding against unwelcome truth, may it return by secret paths and find its way within. Grant that the ears which have heard the voice of Thy songs may be deaf to the voice of clamor and dispute; that the eyes which have seen Thy love, may behold Thy blessed hope; that the feet which have walked in Thy courts may walk only in the region of light, and that the hearts which Thou hast touched may be purified even as by fire. So shall we become masters of ourselves that we may truly serve our country and our God. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, October 14, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

#### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahay	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Stewart
Bridges	Green	McNary	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Minton	Townsend
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Tydings
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Wheeler
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wiley
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE] and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

#### PETITION

Mr. MINTON presented the petition of members of Local Union No. B-9, International Brotherhood Electrical Workers, of Gary, Ind., praying for the retention of the existing embargo on the export of arms and munitions to nations at war, and the maintenance of a policy of strict neutrality, which was ordered to lie on the table.

#### BILLS INTRODUCED

Bills were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 2986. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to cooperate with State and local agencies in carrying out operations against plant and animal diseases and noxious insects and other pests affecting agriculture; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. McKELLAR:

S. 2987. A bill to reform the lease for the Sellwood Station of the Portland, Oreg., post office; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES—AMENDMENTS

Mr. BRIDGES submitted an amendment, and Mr. TAFT submitted four amendments intended to be proposed by them, respectively, to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306), Neutrality Act of 1939, which were severally ordered to lie on the table and to be printed.

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR McNARY ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. TOWNSEND asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on pending neutrality legislation delivered by Senator McNARY October 15, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON REPEAL OF THE ARMS EMBARGO

[Mr. LEE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of the repeal of the arms embargo delivered by Senator THOMAS of Utah before the American Academy of Political and Social Science at Philadelphia on October 14, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR WILEY ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. WILEY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address delivered by himself on October 15, 1939, on the subject of pending neutrality legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY PAUL V. McNUTT BEFORE AMERICAN LEGION, DEPARTMENT OF MARYLAND

[Mr. MINTON asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered at Baltimore, Md., on October 14, 1939, by Paul V. McNutt, Federal Security Administrator, before Social Security Board Post 142 of the American Legion, Department of Maryland, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EDITORIAL BY WILLIAM HIRTH ON PENDING NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

[Mr. CLARK of Missouri asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Missouri Farmer written by William Hirth, president of the Missouri Farmers' Association, and entitled "If This Be Treason," which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS ON NEUTRALITY BY RT. REV. MSGR. JOHN A. RYAN, D. D.

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address entitled "The Misleading Issue of Neutrality," delivered by Rt. Rev. Msgr. John A. Ryan, D. D., which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ASPECTS OF WAR IN EUROPE—ARTICLE BY JACQUES MARITAIN

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Europe Is Already Saved" written by Jacques Maritain and published in the magazine Commonweal, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY JOHN B. TREVOR, JR., ON AMERICA'S ATTITUDE TOWARD EUROPEAN CONFLICT

[Mr. FRAZIER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address delivered by John B. Trevor, Jr., first

vice president of the Allied Patriotic Societies, Inc., on October 9, 1939, relative to pending neutrality legislation, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS ON NEUTRALITY BY MAJ. AL WILLIAMS

[Mr. DANAHER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of neutrality by Maj. Al Williams on October 12, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### PERMANENT CROP CONTROL—EDITORIAL FROM BIRMINGHAM NEWS

[Mr. BANKHEAD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial from the Birmingham News of October 13, 1939, on the subject of permanent crop control, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NEUTRALITY AND PEACE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Senate resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) Neutrality Act of 1939.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho obtained the floor.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Nevada?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there is an amendment pending, but I desire to submit a proposed amendment and have it printed and lie on the table. I will formally offer it after the pending amendment shall have been disposed of. The amendment is very short and I ask leave to have it read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the reading of the amendment? The Chair hears none and the amendment will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) Neutrality Act of 1939, viz:

"Strike out all of that portion of subsection (a) of section 7 after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21, commencing with and including the word 'Provided', down to and including the word 'involved' in line 11, page 22, and substitute in lieu thereof a period after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment of the Senator from Nevada will be printed and lie on the table.

Mr. PITTMAN. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD immediately following the amendment a statement explaining it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The statement presented by Mr. PITTMAN is as follows:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. PITTMAN to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 306) now pending in the Senate:

"Strike out all of that portion of subsection (a) of section 7 after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21, commencing with and including the word 'Provided', down to and including the word 'involved' in line 11, page 22, and substitute in lieu thereof a period after the word 'person' in line 16, page 21."

The existing law, which was adopted in 1937, reads as follows:

"Sec. 3. (a) Whenever the President shall have issued a proclamation under the authority of section 1 of this act, it shall thereafter be unlawful for any person within the United States to purchase, sell, or exchange bonds, securities, or other obligations of the government of any belligerent state or of any state wherein civil strife exists named in such proclamation, or of any political subdivision of any such state, or of any person acting for or on behalf of the government of any such state, or of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, or of any person acting for or on behalf of any faction or asserted government within any such state wherein civil strife exists, issued after the date of such proclamation, or to make any loan or extend any credit to any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person, or to solicit or receive any contribution for any such government, political subdivision, faction, asserted government, or person: *Provided*, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions. Nothing in this subsection shall be construed to prohibit the solicitation or collection of funds to be used for medical aid and assistance, or for food and clothing to relieve human suffering, when such solicitation or collection of funds is made on behalf of and for use by any person or organization which is not acting for or on behalf of any such government, political subdivision, faction, or asserted government; but all such solicitations and collections of funds shall be subject to the approval of the President and shall be made under such rules and regulations as he shall prescribe.



"(b) The provisions of this section shall not apply to a renewal or adjustment of such indebtedness as may exist on the date of the President's proclamation.

"(c) Whoever shall violate the provisions of this section or of any regulations issued hereunder shall, upon conviction thereof, be fined not more than \$50,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both. Should the violation be by a corporation, organization, or association, each officer or agent thereof participating in the violation may be liable to the penalty herein prescribed.

"(d) Whenever the President shall have revoked any such proclamation issued under the authority of section 1 of this act, the provisions of this section and of any regulations issued by the President hereunder shall thereupon cease to apply with respect to the state or states named in such proclamation, except with respect to offenses committed prior to such revocation."

The House of Representatives on the floor amended House Joint Resolution 306 by adding to the proviso a limitation on the discretion of the President by inserting the following words: "for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals", as shown in the following proviso as adopted by the House:

*"Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals ordinary commercial credits and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions; the President shall make public every 90 days any and all exceptions granted under this proviso, together with the amounts of credits involved."*

The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, acting through a majority, desired further to limit the Presidential discretion and therefore struck out the House amendment and added the following language:

[Omit the part in brackets and insert the part printed in italics]

*"Provided, That if the President shall find that such action will serve to protect the commercial or other interests of the United States or its citizens, he may, in his discretion, and to such extent and under such regulations as he may prescribe, except from the operation of this section [for a period of not more than 90 days without renewals,] ordinary commercial credits, and short-time obligations in aid of legal transactions and of a character customarily used in normal peacetime commercial transactions, but only if such credits and obligations have maturities of not more than 90 days and are not renewable. If any government, political subdivision, or person to which credit has been extended pursuant to the authority vested in the President under this subsection is in default in whole or in part upon any obligation to which such extension of credit relates, no further extension of credit to such government, political subdivision, or person shall be made or authorized under this subsection during the period of such default. The President shall report to Congress every 6 months any and all exceptions granted under this subsection, together with the amounts of credits involved."*

The committee, in view of the fact that the proposed substitute amendment to the House bill will have to pass the House of Representatives, gave some consideration to the action of the House with reference to such proviso. Again the committee considered that the Presidential discretion would be governed by the opinion of the Attorney General of the United States in construing the Johnson Act which contained no such proviso as herein proposed to be stricken out. It being the intention of the committee to require settlement in cash or cash equivalents as defined by the Attorney General, I deem it wise to avoid any confusion or any misunderstanding by striking out the entire proviso.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Louisiana?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. ELLENDER. I desire at this time to submit for the consideration of the Senate a series of amendments to the pending joint resolution.

The first amendment deals with the credit portion of the measure. It seeks to change the time limit provided for on page 22 of the resolution from 90 days to 30 days. Should that amendment fail, then, I propose a second amendment, dealing with the same subject, to limit the amount of purchases within the 90 days to \$200,000,000. I am informed that the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations has offered, or will shortly propose, an amendment to eliminate the credit provision in the joint resolution. Should such an amendment prevail, I will, of course, abandon the proposals just submitted by me.

The third amendment deals with the transportation problem involved in the joint resolution. It seeks to exempt the transportation by American vessels of any passenger or any articles or materials other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war listed in the proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 to any place outside the Western

Hemisphere which is not within any area defined as a combat area pursuant to section 3 (a). In short, the amendment simply permits American ships to carry on their normal trade in areas far removed from the danger zones to be established by the President.

The fourth amendment adds a new section and deals with the proposition of amending the Johnson Act. It seeks to broaden the term "foreign government" so as to include all subdivisions thereof, and it is also intended to prevent the sale of bonds for refunding of bonds issued prior to April 13, 1934, by a foreign government in default, except as to such bonds actually owned and held by citizens of the United States prior to said date.

I ask that the proposed amendments may be printed in the usual form and lie on the table, and that also they may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendments intended to be proposed by Mr. ELLENDER were ordered to lie on the table, to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

On page 22, line 1, strike out "90" and insert in lieu thereof "30."

On page 22, line 11, after the period, insert the following new sentences: "In no event shall the aggregate amount of the exceptions granted under this subsection in the case of any foreign government exceed \$200,000,000 during any period of 90 days, commencing with the 90-day period beginning on the date of enactment of this joint resolution. For the purposes of this subsection, the term 'foreign government' includes all its political subdivisions, all its dominions, protectorates, dependencies, and possessions and the political subdivisions thereof, and all persons acting for or on behalf of any of the foregoing."

On page 17, line 25, before the semicolon, insert the following: "or to transportation by American vessels of any passengers or any articles or materials (other than arms, ammunition, and implements of war listed in a proclamation issued under the authority of section 12 (i)) to any place outside the Western Hemisphere which is not within any area defined as a combat area pursuant to section 3 (a)."

On page 18, line 9, after the semicolon, insert "or"; and on page 18, line 14, beginning with the semicolon, strike out through the word "aircraft" in line 18.

At the end of the joint resolution insert the following:

"Sec. 20. The act entitled 'An act to prohibit financial transactions with any foreign government in default on its obligations to the United States,' approved April 13, 1934, is amended to read as follows:

"That hereafter it shall be unlawful within the United States or any place subject to the jurisdiction of the United States for any person to purchase or sell, or to act as the agent of another person to purchase or sell, or to act as agent for the collection of or payment of interest on, the bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government issued after April 13, 1934, or to make any loan to such foreign government, while such foreign government is in default in the payment of its obligations, or any part thereof, to the Government of the United States: *Provided*, That this act shall not apply to the renewal or adjustment of outstanding bonds, securities, or other obligations of any foreign government owned and held prior to April 13, 1934, by any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall upon conviction thereof be fined not more than \$10,000 or imprisoned for not more than 5 years, or both, at the discretion of the court.

"Sec. 2. As used in this act—

"(a) The term 'person' includes any individual, partnership, corporation, or association, other than a public corporation created by or pursuant to special authorization of Congress or a corporation in which the Government of the United States has or exercises a controlling interest through stock ownership or otherwise.

"(b) The term 'foreign government' includes any foreign government or political subdivision thereof and any organization or association acting for or on behalf of a foreign government or political subdivision thereof, and all governments owing allegiance to the same sovereign or to the same general government shall be considered political subdivisions of the same government and a default on the part of any of them shall be held to be a default on the part of all of them.

"(c) A foreign government shall be held to be in default at any time when it has failed to pay in full any payments of principal or interest due to the United States by such foreign government."

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Idaho yield to the Senator from Missouri?

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. I yield.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. I send forward an amendment, and ask that it may be printed in the usual form and lie on the table, and also that it be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CLARK of Missouri was ordered to lie on the

table to be printed, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Amend the committee amendment on page 22 by striking out lines 12, 13, and 14, inclusive.

Mr. CLARK of Idaho. Mr. President, it is not likely that I can add much to this debate. It is with considerable diffidence that I rise to speak at all, in view of the able presentations that have been made here by statesmen infinitely better qualified than I, and with infinitely more ability, judgment, and experience than mine. Perhaps, however, I owe to my colleagues, to the people of my State, and, if you please, to the people of our beloved country, the duty of briefly stating here the reasons which impel me to oppose the repeal of the so-called arms embargo.

Considerable criticism has been leveled at the length of time consumed in this debate in the Senate; but, to my mind, the element of time pales into insignificance when we consider the danger of the issue involved, and the far-flung consequences that may redound to civilization itself as a result of our decision here.

I can think of no greater indictment from the future pen of history than to have it write that the greatest deliberative body on earth—the Senate of the United States—hurriedly and heedlessly impressed upon the country and upon the world a program of this magnitude and of this unparalleled importance.

It is impossible to overestimate the far-reaching consequences of what we may do here. Our children and our children's children, even unto countless generations, will reap the reward of happiness or pay the penalty in debt of our decision, based upon these few weeks of debate.

It is so astonishing as almost to beggar comment that at the outset of the debate in the Senate the public mind was so confused as to the real issues involved in this controversy. There was no public comprehension of what the debate was all about. First, the public was led to believe that it was necessary to choose between the repeal of the arms embargo and a system of cash and carry; secondly, there was never stripped and laid bare before the public the real issue, which now has come to light in this debate, namely, that the prime motivating factor is the repeal of the arms embargo in order to help the British and French Empires. It is unfortunate that it has taken 2 weeks of debate in the Senate at least to strip these issues to their true essentials and their elementary fundamentals.

Of course, the groundwork had been well laid; the stage had been artistically set; and we met here, not as a free, untrammelled forum for debate and deliberation, but rather almost as an executive arm of the Government, not to consider a program but to jam through a program. In my judgment, the extraordinary session of Congress never would have been called had not sufficient assurances and pledges been received by those in charge of the pending joint resolution almost, to their minds, to insure its passage. By that I do not mean to impugn the motives, the sincerity, or the patriotism of any Member of the Senate or of the House of Representatives. If they had sufficiently made up their minds to give a pledge or to give assurance before the session began, it is not for me to put words into their mouths or thoughts into their minds. I can only say that it is unfortunate that the Senate of the United States is almost in executive session, and is not now the free, untrammelled, deliberative body which it has been through the centuries.

Mr. President, the first great issue which confronts the public mind is the confusion between the repeal of the arms embargo and the not inconsistent provisions for cash and carry. At the outset the public was taught that it was necessary to choose one or the other; and even in my own State a glaring example of this occurred. One of our prominent newspapers, published by highly intelligent, patriotic, educated men, conducted a poll of its readers. In that poll the question was asked, "Do you favor the present embargo or do you favor cash and carry?" When an intelligent newspaper—a daily paper, if you please—conducts a poll of that sort, it can be seen how deep into the consciousness of the American

people this terrible confusion has penetrated; and I must say, in all candor, that those who sponsor the pending joint resolution have done little to remove it. I think I may draw an inference from their refusal to accept the motion of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY] to segregate these two consistent issues and dispose first of one and then of the other. I think the only inference which may be logically drawn from that adamant refusal to divide the issue is that they still hoped that the public mind would remain confused. But 2 weeks of Senate debate have, I hope, at least brought home to the people of the country what the issue is on that score, and also that they may have the arms embargo and cash and carry, too; and I am firmly convinced that the great majority of our people would like it so.

The debate in the Senate has finally stripped to sheer nakedness the real issue and the only reason motivating those who want repeal of the arms embargo; and the fact has finally come to light that this reason is not that it is a step toward peace, is not that it is a step toward neutrality, but it is rather now, in all candor, admitted by most of those who advocate repeal that they desire it because they affirmatively wish to aid the British and French Empires in the destruction of Germany.

The genesis of this change in heart on the part of the Senate, the genesis of this candor, the genesis of this ultimate frankness, is interesting and instructive to trace.

On September 21 the President of the United States in person, to a joint session of the Senate and the House, delivered his message wherein he sought to justify the calling of the special session and to outline its purpose. In only one paragraph of that message do we find this purpose defined. Here it is:

I now ask again that such action be taken in respect to that part of the act which is wholly inconsistent with ancient precepts of the laws of nations—the embargo provisions. I ask it because they are, in my opinion, most vitally dangerous to American neutrality, American security, and American peace.

In the use of the phrase "American security" there may be some slight hint of the real purpose behind the repeal of the embargo, but most certainly in the use of the phrases "American neutrality" and "American peace" there is concealed rather than exposed the true purpose.

I do not question the motives of the President of the United States. I have never, in a public address or otherwise, impugned his motives or questioned his sincerity of purpose or his patriotism. In fact, I have praised him as one of the great Presidents of our country for the good he has accomplished. It was for him to make his decision in the choice of the words "American neutrality" and "American peace," not for me. He has made that decision. But it is a far cry from the words of the President of the United States on September 21 to the able speech, the brutally frank, candid, and devastating speech, made on the floor of the Senate toward the end of last week by the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE], who now occupies the Vice President's chair, wherein he stated that in his mind, at least, the objectives of the repeal of the arms embargo were not American peace and American neutrality, but were an affirmative act, which he believed in, calculated to aid Great Britain and France in their prosecution of the war.

Soon after the President delivered his address the newspaper columnists of the country immediately began a savage and a justified tirade, demanding that this issue be stripped of all its sham; that the hypocrisy of the Senate cease; that fundamentals be spoken abroad on this floor and the real issue brought from its hiding place and exposed to the full light of day. One by one eminent Senators courageously and fearlessly have stripped this issue to its essentials, culminating in the eloquent and candid and masterly address of the junior Senator from Nebraska last Wednesday.

I presume it will not be seriously contended at this juncture of the debate that there is any compelling reason for repealing the arms embargo except to aid the British and the French Empires crush Germany. That is the sole issue; that is the only thing that can be debated with any degree of candor from this time on.



Mr. President, it is only fair to say that those who advocate such a course do so in the hope and on the assumption that we can nevertheless keep out of war. Even on the assumption that we can aid Britain and France with methods short of war, for my part I submit that we should not do so. I do not believe that Britain and France, with their mighty empires, should be aided by the United States at this time, and I base my thesis in that respect upon two propositions.

First. By categorically, blankly, and with an arbitrary attitude refusing at this point even to negotiate for peace, they have placed themselves in the role of aggressors, and neither deserve our help nor should they have it.

Secondly. If Germany is crushed, 80,000,000 highly intelligent, technically developed, organized people will, as surely as the sun shines, be driven into the arms of Stalin and into the bosom of communism.

So, even if the repeal of the arms embargo were not a step toward war, as I believe it is, I would oppose it on the ground that it would help Britain and France, who now are not entitled to our help, because of their attitude in refusing even to talk of peace, and because the crushing of Germany would build an empire of communism which then would be a threat to the peace and safety of the entire world.

I know that it is very dangerous for a Senator or anyone else to question the altruism and the democracy of Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier. I know that when we have felt inclined to indulge in such questioning it has been customary to whisper in closed rooms, among our most intimate friends, and then to glance over our shoulders to see whether or not we are overheard. I know that the results of propaganda have been so devastating that even to question the sincerity of Britain or France has meant laying one's self open to the charge of being pro-Hitler and of acquiescing in the methods he has used.

Mr. President, only last week a distinguished and outstanding American, whose patriotism and whose courage are so firmly established that he needs no defense at my hands—Colonel Lindbergh—made a restrained address, in which he dared to say that he did not want arms and ammunition and implements of war sold to Britain and France. What was the result? The always generous, always able, always kindly chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate, the distinguished senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], in a moment of anger, I know, made this statement on Saturday concerning Colonel Lindbergh:

The most unfortunate part of Colonel Lindbergh's statement is that it encourages the ideologies of the totalitarian governments, and is subject to the construction that he approves of their brutal conquest of democratic countries through war or threat of destruction through war.

I know that the distinguished Senator from Nevada did not really mean that, but I only use it to illustrate the length to which passion and emotion will drive men in questioning the patriotism of those who so much as dare lift a finger of suspicion against the altruism of Britain and France. I quote it to show that I realize that I tread on dangerous ground.

But is it not about time that someone raised his voice to question the modern Tallyrands, Richlieus, Machiavellis, and Henry the Eighths, who are playing their bloody game of chess on Europe's chessboard? Is it not about time that, to some extent at least, even in a feeble way, there should be unmasked the perfidy which hides under the guise of statesmanship and honor? Was the time so long ago that we have forgotten our schoolbook history, from which we learned that the Pilgrim Fathers and the other early settlers of this country fled from England and from France to avoid the bloody persecutions undertaken against minorities there? Was it so long ago that we have forgotten that they built a new government and that none knew better than they the intrigues, the falseness, the perfidy of European so-called power politics?

Those things were not dim memories to George Washington. They were living images to him, and were we even to take slight instruction from his teachings we would not be debating the arms embargo today.

Mr. President, only last week the German Government proposed a conference and a truce. Whether we believe that the

terms proposed were too stringent or not is beside the point. Hitler proposed a restoration of Poland, a true Poland and not a Poland consisting to the extent of 50 percent of Germans, Ukrainians, and Russians. He proposed disarmament, and a truce in the meantime. Yet the proposal met only a categorical "No"; it met only a holier-than-thou, supercilious attitude on the part of the Tory financial oligarchy which today controls the destiny of the British and French Empires.

Mr. President, I say that this categorical, blunt refusal—regardless of what we may think of Hitler, and I do not think much of him—places Britain and France today in the role of aggressors and not defenders. They could at least have made some proposal. Their 70-year-old statesmen could certainly have considered whether they should send British boys and German boys and French boys to their deaths without undertaking, at least in some minor way, to bring about a peace now.

What were the reasons given? There were three. First, Britain and France said, "We are the guardians against the persecutions of religious and racial minority groups in Germany, and we cannot treat with a man who indulges in such persecutions."

Second, they said that the object of the war was to destroy nazism; and I presume that means to destroy Germany.

Third, they said, "We cannot take Hitler's word."

Mr. President, those were the three reasons which they gave to the world for their refusal even briefly to consider a conference which might well end this slaughter now. Those were the three reasons they assigned for becoming definitely aggressor nations.

Let us examine those reasons: First, as to the abhorrence which England now shows for religious and racial persecution, setting herself up as their guardian. I suppose it is a terrible indictment of the human race that religious and racial persecution thrives in the world today. It is a sad commentary upon our intelligence, and upon the civilization of which we claim to be proud, and I suppose that there is not a man who would lift his voice in even feeble defense of Hitler or his methods upon that score. Unfortunately, however, the roots of prejudice grow so deep that even unto our own times there is religious and racial persecution throughout the world, to the world's everlasting discredit. The most notorious examples are Germany, Spain, Mexico, Turkey, and Russia.

It is not so long since the mongrel head of the Ku Klux Klan raised itself to strike here at the same minority groups which we now find persecuted in Germany, and for which some of us would go to war. There was not much of a cry for embargoes against Mexico when one-half of its people was persecuting the other half for religious reasons. And we did not want to go to war with Turkey or to impose embargoes against her when Armenians were being slaughtered by the countless thousands and their nationality destroyed.

No; this holier-than-thou attitude of England today is a pretext and a pretense. Paint me a picture of the 6 years of persecution of the Jews, the Catholics, and the Protestants in Germany, paint it as gory and as bloody as you please, and I will paint you one 10 times as brutal, 10 times as savage, 10 times as bloody in the 500 years of British destruction, pillage, rape, and bloodshed in Ireland. And then I will take from the pens of the British writers themselves a bitter, grueling, devastating history of persecutions in India.

I have just said what I thought of the candid and distinguished speech of the Senator from Nebraska, and I would only ask him, when he decries the religious and racial persecutions in Germany, to go back and read the brilliant orations of his namesake and predecessor, another distinguished statesman, Edmund Burke, made at the close of the eighteenth century before the Houses of Parliament in the impeachment trial of Warren Hastings, Governor General of India. When the Senator from Nebraska speaks of persecutions by Hitler during the last few years and describes his actions as brutal, let him read what his predecessor and namesake, Edmund Burke, said about the tortures, the devastation, and the persecution in India under British rule. Then let him remember that trial of Gov. Gen. Warren Hastings

dragged for 7 years, and English "justice" and English "honor" finally acquitted him.

No; it ill behooves England, it ill behooves France, with the record of persecution of religious and racial minorities even within their own borders, now to refuse at least to treat for peace rather than send their own boys to die because, as they say, and as is probably true, Hitler persecutes racial and religious minorities.

The second point which Mr. Chamberlain now makes in order to justify his sending men to death is that aggression, Nazi aggression, must be stamped out. A splendid motive indeed, Mr. Chamberlain, if we could even begin to believe, in view of your past history or the record of the ruling classes of your government, that you even so much as halfway meant it.

Aggression. The outstanding example of aggression that the world has ever seen is that of the British Empire. This Empire has been built upon conquest, upon aggression, and it is worthy of note, Mr. President, that that aggression has usually taken form against helpless and defenseless peoples. Seldom indeed have British armies been massed against a virile and a prepared people. Only in their wars against France was this so. But always British armies were sent to the corners of the world to prey upon savage, uncouth, and unarmed peoples; and from Great Britain's vast colonial empire, obtained almost entirely by aggression, she has drawn streams of gold from the streams of human blood and human labor that exist there.

England has been at war more than half of its entire history, and only one of those wars could even remotely be called a defensive war.

It is not so long, Mr. President, since British shot and British canister crashed through the very roof of the building in which we deliberate today, and laid this magnificent Capitol building in ruins.

So now, when England, glutted with the gains of conquest of centuries, holds up her hand again and says that she is going to send her boys to death to stamp out aggression, it ill becomes her indeed.

It may be said that is ancient history? By the Treaty of Versailles England and France added by conquest to their already swollen empires 1,000,000 square miles of new territory, a territory 5 times as large as the Poland of which we hear so much, and 20 times as large as Czechoslovakia.

No; the conquest is not ended, and if Chamberlain came into a court of equity and said that he would not talk peace because he could not believe in Hitler's word, that he could not rely upon it, I do not believe he would come into that court of equity with clean hands. So let us not be deceived on that score.

What is the third reason which Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier advance for not wishing to talk peace, but on the contrary for saying that they are going to send their boys to war? What is the third reason? Ah, they say, "We cannot trust Hitler's word." Of course, they cannot, and nobody knows that better than Mr. Chamberlain; and nobody knows better than he knows and the whole world knows that when it has been to British interests the British word and British honor have meant no more than that of one, A. Hitler.

The crowning example of the reason that they cannot trust Hitler's word is given as Munich. They say he said at Munich that if he were given a part of Czechoslovakia he would not make further encroachments upon Europe. He did not intend to keep that word, and hence he lied. But let us examine Munich further.

France and England had a treaty with Czechoslovakia guaranteeing that little democracy against aggression and promising the world that if she were attacked they would aid her in a military way. Yet when Chamberlain and Daladier thought at Munich that for their own interests they could bribe Hitler by breaking their own written treaty obligations it was an easy decision for them to make. They tried to bribe Hitler by breaking their own word first. Perhaps they could have learned a lesson from a famous English jurist by the name of Jeffreys, who sat upon the criminal court bench of England a long time ago. He had

such an odious reputation for hanging criminals and for ferocious justice that he became known as "bloody Jeffreys, the hanging judge of England." But it was noticed that Mr. Justice Jeffreys got rich beyond the salary of his office, and so in his later years, as the legend goes, a friend asked him how throughout all these years he could have maintained his reputation for severity. "How could you obtain the name of 'the hanging judge of England' and yet apparently become rich?" He replied in a simple sentence, "I took their bribes and hanged them, too." So Hitler at Munich took England's bribe and hanged her, too!

Was it a greater breach of faith for Hitler to state that he had no more intentions of attacking Europe, when he knew he had, or was it a greater breach of faith for England and France brazenly to violate an existing treaty? Yet they cannot take Hitler's word!

And Poland! Mr. President, when history is written, the betrayal of Poland by England and France will go down as the greatest "sell-out" of modern times. Not content with betraying Czechoslovakia in the hope that their bribe would stick, they then made overtures to Poland, a nation that was getting along quite well with Germany at that time, and, if you please, with loans and otherwise, enticed Poland into an encirclement program. So they gave to Poland the same guaranty they had given to Czechoslovakia, that they would protect her with their military and naval might. Poland could have granted every one of Hitler's demands a few months ago. She could have returned Danzig, the Polish Corridor, and even upper Silesia without bringing herself to destruction. But, egged on by England and France, depending upon her treaty of military alliance, she refused to do this, and chose invasion instead. I do not justify that invasion. No one can. I only say that Britain and France egged Poland on to it, to her ultimate destruction.

Then did Britain fulfill her second treaty obligation? Did she or France go to the aid of Poland? They did not. I can still remember listening to the radio in the evening a few weeks ago, and hearing that lonely little radio station in Warsaw, after almost 2 weeks of siege, bleating through the air, "We will not give up. We will fight to the bitter end. Our city is in ruins, but we will die." Poland's generals had deserted her. Her President and her Government officials had fled to the sanctuary of another country. The radio announcer said:

We will not give up because we can depend upon the British promise. We can depend upon British honor to come to our assistance.

Mr. President, it would have taken only a brief radio message from London to tell the gallant little garrison in Warsaw that defense was hopeless. It would have taken only a short radio word to tell the mayor of Warsaw that the generals of his army had ignominiously fled, that his country was in ruins, and that he had better not subject his city to destruction and his people to devastating death. But the message never came from French or British honor, and Warsaw was sent to her destruction by British honor and by British promises, in order that its destruction might be used as propaganda to inflame the people of the United States against the aggressor.

Mr. President, I ask, Which was the worst criminal—he who did the destroying or he who sold out to the destroyer? I think history will record that this was the greatest betrayal ever known to modern man. I find support for that view from the pens of two eminent British statesmen, David Lloyd George, and Britain's outstanding intellect, George Bernard Shaw. It is peculiar that we cannot say those things in this country when Lloyd George and Bernard Shaw say them so bitterly in England itself.

British honor. British promises. When Russia came in and invaded half of Poland, where was the British promise to defend her integrity? Not only did she not have the desire or the courage to declare war on Russia, as she had agreed to do, but now, according to her own press dispatches, she is entering into an agreement with Russia to furnish her certain strategic war materials in return for tin and rubber. Explain that if you can. She not only failed to



keep her written treaty obligations and declare war on Russia but actually courted Russia and agreed to furnish her tin and rubber for her implements of war, further to destroy Poland.

Chamberlain says he will not talk peace with Germany because he cannot depend upon Hitler's word. Britain lied to us when she incurred war debts which she never intended pay. She lied again when she told us she could not pay those debts, and yet with the same breath proceeded to spend twice as much in the development of armaments. She first lied to the Arabs in Palestine, and when they became too hot for her she lied to the Jews whom she had sent there. The British Empire is built on two things—blood and treachery. Ethiopia is another example.

Therefore, Mr. President, I for one am unwilling that we should repeal the arms embargo to furnish aid and comfort to England when she has refused even to discuss peace for such sham reasons. I am unwilling that we should become a party to any such proceeding, even if it would not mean war.

But there is another reason, and that is that if the German people should now be destroyed they would have nowhere to go but to the bosom of Stalin and into the communism of Russia. When once German technique and German organizing ability are married to the natural resources of Russia and the doctrine of communism, in only a short time we shall have a communistic empire which will then destroy the French and the British empires, and may even become a menace to us.

So let Mr. Chamberlain and Mr. Daladier, if they will, drive 80,000,000 brilliant, educated, hard-working people to the doctrine of communism, and then let us see what will happen. We shall have a peace worse than Versailles. We shall have a peace from which can only come the destruction of democracy in Europe in real truth. Versailles created Hitler. He is nothing more than the red-hot lava belching out of the German volcano. The fires of that volcano were lighted by Britain and France at Versailles. They have created a Frankenstein monster with their own hands, and now they want our aid to help destroy it.

Mr. President, all I have said thus far has been based on the assumption that we can still help England and France with methods "short of war." I do not propose to help them under present conditions, even if that be true.

But is it true? Whether or not the repeal of the arms embargo is a step toward war cannot be either proved or disproved with mathematical certainty. We cannot reduce the future to an algebraic equation. It is all a question of what values we give to imponderable premises. It is all a question of what weight we give to factors which may operate in future. I take the position that repeal of the arms embargo is an inevitable step toward war, but I cannot prove it; neither can it be disproved. I base that assumption upon two premises. We have only our own personal experience to go by, and we have only the experience of the last World War. If those experiences indicate that it is not a step toward war, well and good; but, in my judgment, they overpoweringly prove, if it can be proved, that repeal of the arms embargo is the first step on the road to war.

Mr. President, did anyone ever buy chips in a game of chance without later engaging in the play? Did anyone in his boyhood days ever make snowballs for one side without very soon beginning to hurl the missiles himself? I think not. As the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has so well said, I think we cannot engage in the occupation of being an armorer for one side without sooner or later being a warrior for that side.

So, if our past personal experience means anything, it means that if we want to keep out of war we had better keep off the threshold of war. The step across the threshold is short and easy; it is not difficult to make. Do you realize, Mr. President, that every airplane, every bombing plane, every bomb, and every machine gun that is sent to England and France to be used for purposes of destruction in Germany will bear the initials "U. S. A." and probably the name of its maker? What do you suppose the German

soldiers will think when American bombs bearing the initials "U. S. A." rain down upon their cities? What do you suppose German mothers will think when they see their sons killed by American bullets?

Mr. President, if we should send American bombers over there for that purpose, if we should send machine guns over there with those letters written on them—and even if they were not so initialed they would be easily recognized—we might just as well put on them also in large and unmistakable print the letters "R. S. V. P.". When we send our airplanes to Germany for purposes of destruction we start in to fight, and from then on, once we have taken the plunge, it is not a question of where the stream is flowing, but only how swift is the current.

In addition to our own personal experiences, we have the experiences that led us into the last World War. It affords a curious study to read about the chain of circumstances which transformed us from a peaceful Nation into a warlike country that was ready to go, and did go, to war. I will not recount them here; but sufficient it is to say that it is beyond my feeble comprehension how anyone can read such books as Mills' *Road to War*, or the expert documented work of Professor Peterson, *Propaganda for War*, and be in favor of repealing the arms embargo, unless he is willing ultimately to go to war.

Mr. President, I have endeavored, primarily, to clear two confusing issues that have existed in the minds of the people of the country: First, that it is impossible to have repeal of the arms embargo and cash and carry at the same time; and, second, that the real admitted issue now is, Shall we repeal the arms embargo in order to help the British and French Empires crush Germany?

With respect to the latter issue, I have taken the position that we should not, even if we could do so, by methods short of war, undertake to aid Great Britain and France to crush Germany for two reasons:

First, they have become aggressor nations by refusing, on sham pretext and pretense, even to consider the offers for peace; and, second, if they should crush Germany, we would have a peace worse than that of Versailles; Germany would be driven into the hands of Stalin and communism, and a communistic empire would arise that might overwhelm the earth.

I have said also that I think to repeal the arms embargo, besides doing these things is a step on the road to war, judging from our personal experiences and from our knowledge of events that led us into the last World War. So I respectfully submit to you, Mr. President, to my colleagues in the Senate, and to the American people, that the embargo should be retained.

One of us is wrong, one of us is terribly, horribly wrong. It will not do for those who are proposing to effectuate the repeal of the arms embargo, if that act should lead us into the war, later to say, "We meant well." This is not a game of checkers that can be lost and laughed at and forgotten; this is not like placing a few coppers on the horse races, which, if they are lost, the bettor can go away and forget. No; this is a gamble of life and a gamble of death. I think that we who oppose the repeal of the arms embargo choose the safer course. I think those on the other side, with their patriotism and with their desire to help England and France, are gambling that repeal of the embargo will keep us out of war, and thereby they are gambling with death. It will not do later, if their gamble turns out to be on the losing side, to say to the muse of history, "We meant well." It will matter us little when we are indicted before the bar of history to plead in defense, "We had good intentions." When some future Dante writes another *Inferno*, perhaps some of us will have a spot there, and in large and fiery letters, if the gamble of those who are advocating the passage of the pending joint resolution fails will be written the words, "They meant well."

I only hope, Mr. President, that in my limited and inexperienced understanding I do not see this issue in its true light; I only hope that I have not been given the light to see the issue involved here as I do see it, because I gamble

on far less than those who advocate repeal of the arms embargo. So, as I conclude, Mr. President, I leave with the Senate just one wish, which is sincere and from my heart, that the proponents of the measure and not I may be right.

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, in rising to address the Senate at this hour in the progress of this debate, which happens to be the hour of the day when, I know, Senators customarily are at lunch, I am not presumptuous enough to assume that I can change the views of any Senator who has followed the course of the discussion. I feel, however, that a man in public life, carrying a responsibility in connection with legislation involving a momentous decision, owes it to his constituents and to his country to give his reasons for the decision he reaches. That is the purpose of my rising to address the Senate this afternoon.

We have been debating what is called neutrality legislation. It is said that such legislation is necessary in order to keep us out of war. Those who defend the repeal of the arms embargo say they want to keep this country out of war and that repeal will have that effect. Those who take the opposite view make the same profession of intention.

If the main issue is that we shall keep out of war, then, it seems to me, the first question to decide is, Do we want to keep out of war; have we the will to keep out of war? It seems to me that if we have the will to keep out, little legislation is necessary. If a man does not want to commit murder, he does not have to have a law to keep him from committing murder. If he wants to commit murder, he will usually find a way to do it, irrespective of what law has been enacted to prevent murder or punish the perpetrator of such a crime. So I think we ought to look back of this legislation and determine whether or not it is our will and purpose to keep out of war.

It is said, in order to keep out of war, we must be neutral, and so we must have neutrality legislation. So-called neutrality legislation is an act to restrain certain citizens. Private citizens are restrained by the Government in order to keep them from doing certain things that might cause us to become involved in the war.

It is not only the acts of private citizens that may get us into war; the acts of public officials are far more dangerous and far more effective in that direction, because public officials have a responsibility for restraining citizens from committing unneutral acts; and they themselves, as men in authority, have a duty to see that as public officials they so restrain their public acts that they cannot be justifiably accused of being unneutral as officials of the Government, speaking for the Government. We say our citizens may not do this and must not do that. We who sit in places of responsibility must ourselves take that medicine, not only Senators and Members of the House of Representatives but the Chief Executive and members of the Cabinet as well. We must see that we do not take sides if that is what is meant by neutrality.

I have a definition of neutrality. There are many different definitions of neutrality, so I go to the authority to which I have usually gone to find the meaning of any word. I go to Webster's International Dictionary, which defines, in international law, neutrality as—

The condition of a state or government which refrains from taking part, directly or indirectly, in a war between other powers. The right to observe neutrality and the name "neutrality" are both comparatively modern, all persons anciently having been considered as friends or foes—

Of the contending parties.

If that is the correct definition of neutrality—that a nation, to be neutral, must not take sides, directly or indirectly, in a war between powers—then that means that we should not, directly or indirectly, by any public act as a government, take sides in a controversy, and that principle should guide us if we really want to keep neutral. However, on the question of neutrality there seems to be a great difference of opinion. Men in high public places, speaking with the authority of high office, say we can do things against one side in favor of another, and be neutral, and refrain from going to war. I do not understand that kind of language or reasoning. It

reminds me of the definition of "fair" as given by a man having civil litigation. He complained about the rulings of the judge. He said, "The judge is not fair." A man asked him why he thought the judge was not fair. "Well," he said, "a fair judge would be on the right side, and my side is right. But he overrules my attorney's motions and objections, and so I know he is not fair, because," he said, "a fair judge would be on the right side, and my side is right." [Laughter.] That is the definition which I seem to obtain from some persons as giving their idea of neutrality.

I believe we can best serve the interests of the United States by keeping neutral. I know of no other definition by which to measure neutrality than that given by Webster's International Dictionary, stating that neutrality consists of a government taking no sides, directly or indirectly, between two countries engaged in war. While I have listened with great respect to Senators whose personal emotions are with England and France, and have heard them openly admit that they want to take sides and help one side against the other, and while I have no doubt everyone has his sympathies, we are not here to act upon our personal emotions. We are here as public officials to make decisions for the benefit of the country, irrespective of our emotions. As a public official, I do not want on the floor of the Senate to express my personal emotions, because I am not speaking here as an individual. My personal emotions are mine. My public official duties require me to have no emotions and to have no partiality in a controversy except to look out for what I consider to be the best interests of the people of the United States. That is my conception of the duties of a public official.

The technicalities of the embargo, the repeal or the failure to repeal, have been so thoroughly expounded by both sides of the controversy that I am not going to spend any time on that subject, except to say that it seems to me the repeal of the embargo at this time would be directly or indirectly taking sides in a controversy. If we are going to take sides, let us be open and aboveboard about it. If we are going to stay neutral, let us not take sides directly or indirectly with either side. I do not think we have yet come to the pass where we are willing to take sides openly, one way or the other, in an official act. We should not do it by subterfuge.

We have heard a great deal in the past few years about "the duty America owes to the world," the natural urge of the missionary who has heard the propaganda that we must do missionary work in the political fields of Europe, and give Europe moral leadership; that Europeans are so ignorant that with battleships and bombs and bayonets we must enter every controversy in Europe for the purpose of teaching them something and making them as good as we are. I have never had any sympathy for that kind of propaganda. Too much of that kind of missionary work has been done down through the pages of history. Much of the misery in the world it owes to those who, for the good of those they have shot and conquered and mutilated, have done that kind of missionary work throughout the pages of history.

Then we have heard a great deal about the sanctity of treaties—particularly peace treaties; and we have heard a great deal about designating the aggressor and punishing the aggressor. Just what does that mean? If you designate or indict a criminal, it is up to you to convict him and to punish him. Who are aggressors? In the terms of the modern diplomat, an aggressor is a nation which violates a treaty, particularly a peace treaty, because peace treaties are sanctified. They are sacrosanct. They are international law. So peace treaties which have been written must not be broken; they must not be changed; and anyone who by force changes them is an aggressor, and must be punished.

If that is to be our policy, I should like to ask, Where shall we begin, and where shall we end? I should like to know where there is a powerful nation which has not violated peace treaties. Where is there one? Where is there such a nation which has not engaged in international banditry and been an aggressor at one time or another?

If that is to be our policy, we shall have to punish other nations to the end of time. Then we shall find it necessary



to engage in the new war of extermination which we are told is coming, because it is said that one nation is ready to fight a war of extermination to prevent another war of extermination. If they do not succeed in exterminating all, then it will be up to us to determine who is the aggressor and go and exterminate the aggressor. I do not understand that line of reasoning.

Every treaty of peace—treaties which are called so sacred in history—has always carried within it the seeds for the next war. There is nothing sacred about them. From the beginning of time that has been true. The Treaty of Vienna, the first and second treaties of Paris after the Napoleonic wars, the treaty of 1870 after the Franco-Prussian War—all these were based upon a sadistic urge upon the part of those who conquered to punish and mutilate the conquered.

We do not have to go across the water to be reminded of the sadistic urge which has taken possession of conquerors. All we have to do is to sit right here at home and read the history of what the North and the Congress at Washington did to the Southern States after the Civil War. This country has not to this day recovered from that sadistic persecution. While General Grant offered terms of surrender which were humane, the politicians in Congress were as cruel to the South as though they were dealing with savages, and this country has not to this day recovered from the effects of the treatment of the South by the Congress at Washington, controlled by the North. That is one of the blackest pages in American history; but all wars have kindred results.

We have now before us in the world the inevitable result of the last treaty of peace, the Treaty of Versailles. It is hard for some people to believe it, but statesmen in Europe realize it very well. A year ago I visited six countries, and I found the statesmen in every country admitting that most of their troubles at that time were due to the Treaty of Versailles. They said, "Adjustments have to be made. We hope we can make them peacefully. It costs something to have peaceful adjustments of these matters, but it will not cost as much as war; and we do not want war." Well, they have it now.

The Foreign Secretary of Belgium stated, after they severed their connection and renounced the Treaty of Locarno, that he could not risk the safety of his nation upon the theory of the Treaty of Locarno. The Prime Minister of Sweden about a year ago said that the peace of Europe and the rehabilitation of Europe could only be brought about upon the wreckage of the Treaty of Versailles.

Talk about the sanctity of treaties! We have heard too much of that from people who should know better.

The years 1938 and 1939 were singularly prolific in disappointments and disillusionment not only for the many millions of human beings directly affected but for all those who for these last two decades have hoped that finally mankind would recognize a few of the errors of its conduct and do better.

Twenty years ago those who thought they had won the World War sat down in Paris for the purpose of fashioning a lasting peace, as they said. The Central Powers had been defeated after a struggle that taxed to the utmost the military and economic resources of the allied and associated governments.

It had been trumpeted to the world that the World War was fought to end all war; that it had been waged to make the world safe for democracy and make it a better place in which to live. There was to be a peace without victory. Self-determination was to be the rule thereafter, and minorities of any sort were to be protected against oppression.

President Woodrow Wilson had become the leader in this movement. He realized, no doubt, that these changes would have to be made if the war was not to be lost for everybody. Unfortunately, he took too much for granted. Once the German armies had been overcome, the old brand of diplomacy had the right-of-way again. David Lloyd George had been in favor of the 14 points, which constituted the Wilson program of peace without victory.

Here was an international agreement, the armistice, on which Germany laid down her arms. But after they laid

down their arms no one paid any attention to that agreement. There was a violation of an international agreement. But it was soon a case of "when the devil was sick, the devil a monk would be; when the devil was well, the devil a monk was he." It was so with Clemenceau. Now that the backs of France and her Allies were no longer against the wall, the situation was different.

I am one of those who hold that without the economic and military resources of the United States of America the Allies would not have succeeded in worsting the troops of the Central Powers group. Sane students of human affairs no longer doubt this, though for a while it was a popular claim that the World War was fought by the Allies for the sole purpose of protecting America. For a decade this absurdity made the rounds, and I suppose that even today one could find dilapidated intellects who defend that claim.

The fact is that our getting into the European war, and thus making it a World War, produced a whole series of lamentable conditions.

I may say that if those who are trying to get us into another World War succeed, we will have another series of very lamentable conditions, and I do not believe our economy or our political institutions can survive.

The allied and associated governments won the war too completely, as it were, and in so doing lost it. The way things look now, they would have been very much better off if they had used some sense at Versailles. Instead of a peace without victory, we got victory without peace. Instead of making the world safe for democracy, we made it highly unsafe. Instead of making the world a better place in which to live, we assisted in lowering the standard of living everywhere, our own country included. Instead of protecting minorities by self-determination or otherwise, we seem to have made them the footfalls of dictators. In other words, the whole Wilsonian program was frustrated. The vanquished were stripped of territory at home and abroad, and impossible reparations were imposed. Three empires were dismantled and their fragments fed to the wolves. When the several treaties which ended the World War had been signed, not a vestige was left of international morality and sanity, and the law of the nations. It was, indeed, a case of woe to the vanquished, and to the victor belong the spoils. The law of the tooth and claw was supreme, as it always has been in international relations. This, despite the fact that the solemn covenant of the armistice under which the Central Powers laid down their arms promised an entirely different peace.

Who, today, talks about the sanctity of the armistice agreement? Who talks today about the 2,000,000 who died from hunger in Germany, because of the starvation blockade put into effect by the Allies in order to compel Germany to sign the treaty of peace? Yet the sacred promises made to the Central Powers on November 11, 1918, were disregarded as though they had been a scrap of paper. The bad faith that was Versailles had its beginning when the real promises of the armistice were discarded by the powers that offered them a pledge. Versailles became a torture chamber in which the language of the armistice agreement was mauled and twisted until it was made to sound as though the final wording of the treaty had been what was intended all along. That may have been the intent of some, but it was not that of the armistice, which America had helped bring about. Before we condemn those who, we say, have violated a sacred treaty, let us remember where this unholy business began.

It is not my intention to take up the time of the Senate with minute details as to what effects the several World War treaties produced. The effect was entirely negative in every instance, producing the very opposite of what the high signatories expected and what the defeated signatories promised under duress. However, I must point out that there was no disarmament on the part of those who disarmed the Central Powers, even though they themselves had agreed to disarm, and no indication that a revision of the "peace" treaties in question would ever be undertaken. It cannot have escaped my colleagues, of course, that finally territories were retaken by those who lost them; that armies were called into being in defiance of the peace treaties; and that a rather complete

revision of certain of these peace treaties was undertaken without the high contracting parties having so much as a comma of say in the matter. I think that is quite clear by now. I am inclined to think that there will be more of this as we go along.

What was the basis upon which the several World War treaties was rested by the Paris Peace Conference? For the greater part, it was a series of secret treaties, of which President Wilson seems to have remained ignorant until he made that first unfortunate and ill-advised trip to Paris for the purpose, I take it, of seeing to it that this 14-point program was not overlooked.

We have here the secret treaties, of which we were not informed when we entered the war, although the evidence now shows that they were in the State Department all the time. When Wilson came back from his first ill-advised trip to Paris he said he did not know anything about those secret treaties until he arrived at Paris. I suppose those treaties were as sacred as other treaties of history. Of course, Wilson went over to see that his 14 points were not forgotten when the treaty was made.

All these secret treaties were held from the knowledge of the world until after the war was ended. The fact is that much of Europe, Africa, and Asia had been "allocated," which is a beautiful term to be used for robberies of that sort. I am simply recalling this part of history in order to show that nations travel over the same ground, that history repeats itself. While we think we are facing new problems today, as a matter of fact we are only emphasizing the statement of Heine that the only thing humanity learns from history is that it cannot learn anything. So we do not recognize the same symptoms of disease when they appear from time to time.

Then the League of Nations was formed as a holding company for so-called mandates. Great Britain was to have her share of the loot; France was to get her share out of the war for democracy and for international justice; and Japan got her share. It was taken away from her at the disarmament conference later, but she is getting her share now without any opposition from her former allies in the World War. Serbia waxed fat as a consequence of the murder of Sarajevo; Rumania passed into the possession of territories to which she had not the least historical, economic, or cultural claim. Here and there new states were created by throwing minorities into their laps. All in all it was the same old story.

The making of treaties of many sorts was incident to this. First of all the delegates of the defeated powers signed on the dotted line without having had a say in what they signed. Their signature was simply a mea culpa, which is polite Latin for "I am guilty." They could not do anything else. Their women and children were starved by the blockade. Therefore they had to sign. Certainly they were guilty of some things, but they were not the only ones who were guilty.

Next came a whole series of treaties that created states where none had previously been, and finally this orgy in ink ended in dozens of treaties that were to insure throughout all time the new conditions thus created. Treaties and alliances, military conventions and commercial agreements grew like mushrooms after a warm rain of a summer's night, and over this mass production of understandings presided, with much aplomb and dignity, the now moribund League of Nations, which we had the good sense not to join.

The League of Nations, as the refrigerator in which the plans of the "peace" treaty framers were to be preserved forever, was no great success, due to the fact that human life is a thing in flux and must remain that, if mankind is to be as happy as its many limitations and handicaps permit.

They forgot that, after all, humanity is made up of nothing but human beings who may from time to time change their minds. Conditions change, so they change their minds, and governments change their policies with changed conditions. But that treaty was to settle the peace and the boundaries of the world forever. They made provisions that under cer-

tain conditions there could be revision; but, of course, nobody paid any attention to that.

There was one thing the League of Nations could not do. It might well serve as the repository of treaties made directly and indirectly under its auspices, but it was powerless when it came to making the defeated powers toe the mark in the long run. So long as the interests of the bosses of the League held to parallel courses all was well. But a day came when the tides of time changed in many parts of the world. The League had no means for the enforcement of the treaties that had been hatched under its auspices. Its leading members forsooth set out on piratical courses. There came into existence such a thing as the "unofficial" or "undeclared" war. Of all the hypocrisies of which the human mind is capable, this is the culmination, the very fruition of deceit and malfeasance.

Of course France had a terrific war to reduce the Riffs in Africa, whose country was given to her to upbuild and to civilize under the mandate; and she civilized them, not with a Krag but with the weapon used by the French Army—I do not remember its name. However, it was not the Krag with which we "civilized" the Filipinos. Perhaps the most remarkable aspect of it all is that governments the world over have found it expedient to recognize this new departure in international turpitude by giving it the stamp of their approval, by not insisting that a state of war is a state of war, no matter how it began. Of course we have found a remedy for that also. We generally do so. We simply refuse to recognize the conquests made as the result of "undeclared" wars, which no doubt makes a lot of difference to the poor devils involved.

Naturally there has been much talk about treaties while all this went on. For instance, we hear a great deal about the sanctity of treaties and pacts, and many seem to be in the habit of almost losing their reason when such an agreement is violated by one of the contracting parties. What we all too often forget is that treaties at their best are but mile-stones in history, documents showing that on such and such a date two or more governments came together for the purpose of recording something on which they were in agreement. One of the parties agrees under duress. On the other hand, not a few treaties have been conceived and written in deceit.

Of treaties, pacts, conventions, and the like we have a great variety. The only ones worth the paper they are written on are those which regulate commercial relations, and this for the reason that they deal with tangibles and confer mutual benefits. The commercial interests they represent and foster belong to the realities of life and are cared for by people who are in the habit of dealing with concrete facts of trade and industry. Very often investments are based on commercial treaties, and a large measure of business honesty and common sense enters into them for that reason. But this is more in the consular than in the diplomatic department of foreign relations. In course of time I have gained the impression, however, that the real diplomatist is not greatly interested in commercial treaties, because making them is rated as humdrum and lacking glamour.

The treaties that have brought so much misfortune to man are those of peace and alliance. The peace treaty, be it bilateral or multilateral, is usually an instrument that shoulders upon the vanquished the burden of defeat. It follows, then, that the one who must accept the conditions of such a treaty will do so only until he is strong enough to refuse doing so. Of this we have seen a great deal during the past years in Europe, and we probably shall see more of it during the new year soon coming. To expect that such a treaty will be honored long beyond the day on which the vanquished were obliged to sign the treaty is to live in a fool's paradise. To be sure, such a treaty may contain some provision as to its revision in the future, but the one who imposed the treaty is not likely to rush that date. The one who had to take what was handed him will consider himself competent to break that treaty on the day on which he feels that his state of servitude is over. With the return of his potency comes quite naturally



a desire to free himself from the bondage the peace treaty in question imposed upon him.

Much the same has to be said of treaties of alliance. Governments, like men, make new friends, and there is always the inclination to exchange the treaty of alliances with a weaker power for similar treaties with a stronger one, even if this should ultimately result in fighting against the very government and people with whom one was formerly allied.

The World War saw several such examples. In matters of that sort necessity knows no morals, especially such necessity as is represented in furthering the public interest by getting a share of the spoils.

While we talk about international law, international justice, and so forth, we know that in the last World War the chief powers were bidding for neutrals, one against the other, to join them. Certainly history indicates that those who got the biggest price went where the biggest price came from. I am not saying that we got anything out of it. We did not go in under the same circumstances. They did not have to pay us anything. We paid for the privilege of going in, and we are still paying, and will continue to pay for generations to come.

Much of the story of mankind consists of accounts of treaties of peace and alliance being violated. Historians generally condemn the practice. But it must be said for our chroniclers that generally they are not practical men. Very often they are idealists; more often, indeed, they are half-baked intellects and mere scribes who copy the records of the past without exercising judgment. From that fact has come the universal notion that treaties of any sort are sacrosanct. To put such documents upon so high a plane is both puerile and dangerous. Usually, a false sense of security is born of that practice. Treaties, of course, are very impressive. Loaded as they are with bombast and sententiousness, they impress the public far beyond the reasonable. They have been known to cause much loss of sleep to legislators, because men in high places are not immune to believing finally the fairy tales they relate.

Where is the statesman who does not contemplate his latest effort in treaty-making with a great deal of awe? To make as many treaties as possible appears to be a passion with every diplomat. Every new treaty of which it has been my pleasure to learn was not only the very latest improvement upon all treaties that went before but it was really the only thing of its kind. When it comes to discovering the obvious, diplomats simply cannot be beaten.

It were well to remember that diplomacy and treaty making are an old business.

There is mention of an ambassador in records dating back some 6,000 years. It seems that the person of this august man was not as well respected as it should have been. There is mention of other diplomats at about 2960 B. C.; and, finally, we learn the names and mission of two such high dignitaries in the twenty-first year of the reign of Pharaoh Rameses the Second. Tarte-Sebu and Rameses, the ambassadors of the King of the Hittites and the King of Egypt, respectively, negotiated a treaty, to last forever, for their principals. The original text of the treaty in question was engraved upon tablets of silver. But these disappeared during the ages. Luckily, the text had also been cut twice into the walls of an Egyptian temple. Being of worthless rock, this medium fared better. We owe to it a better understanding of international relations and affairs in ancient times. Its counterpart has since then been found in a clay tablet on the site of the old Hittite capital.

The treaty is general in its nature, and is now a little more than 42 centuries old; but it is hardly necessary to point out that it did not bind the high contracting parties too long. We do not know just when the wars between the Syrian coalition and Egypt were resumed. However, we see that before long the King of the Hittites, named Kheta-Sar, and Rameses the Second were at it again. At a later day Rameses the Third continued this war, and thus provided posterity with as fine a hymn of hate, known as the Battle of Kadesh, as antiquity and our own times could well produce. Some scribe of the Royal Egyptian Government certainly outdid

himself when he penned this remarkable screed, though it is possible that some of the copious output of the World War scribblers is better. To tell the truth, the Battle of Kadesh appears to me to be lacking in "pep." The worst adjective I found in it, and, before me, M. Champollion, the famous French Egyptologist, whose translation I consulted, is the wild word "abominable." After all, even the Hittites must have found that rather soft.

Be that as it may, the text of the treaty in question is remarkable enough to get a little attention from us. It shows that even now, after 42 centuries, there is very little new even in diplomacy and international relations, contrary to what the world believed when the big four sat down in Paris two decades ago really to do something about it.

The treaty is dated "in the city of Pa-Ramessumery-Amen, Tybi 21, xxi." For instance, there was to be "open diplomacy openly arrived at." Grandfather appears to have been an institution in both Egypt and the land of the Kheta. Both Rameses and Kheta-Sar have their respective august fathers and grandfathers mentioned, and then express the pious wish that the supreme deities of both Egypt and Kheta "will prevent the coming of enmities forever." The treaty goes on to say that "there shall be good peace and brotherhood between them forever" and their descendants and successors to their thrones. It is agreed that neither of the contracting parties shall make raids upon the territories of the other, and that they shall refrain from invasion and looting. It is then provided that the terms of an older treaty made between the Egyptian and Hittite rulers of preceding years shall be continued "and performed in an equitable manner." It is a typical Locarno, or League of Nations treaty.

Next comes the clause of military alliance. The Egyptian government shall come to the aid of the Kheta in case they are attacked, and vice versa, though the king of either nation need not personally enter the conflict, if he deems that course desirable. In that case he need but send his soldiers and chariots. Failure to do so, continues the document with considerable naivete, would make Rameses angry. The rulers of the Hittites had the same privilege, of course. This shall also apply to cases in which frontier tribesmen are the offenders—a rather far-seeing proviso when we consider that the boundaries of both Egypt and Kheta were rather far-flung, and for this reason, in many cases, were more easily reached from military bases of the allied country.

The next condition of the treaty is that the subjects of each ruler shall not be allowed to transfer their allegiance to the other. This appears to have been a desideratum of the greatest importance, for it is immediately followed by the most solemn engagement, with appeal to the deities, that this provision is to be strictly kept. What it all amounts to is, of course, that the many races then peopling Palestine were in the habit of making free with their allegiance when there was gain in it. Rameses and Kheta-Sar simply hoped to make their borders permanent in this manner—borders which, as already indicated, were formed by the districts of Palestine and Syria, inhabited by people who were neither Egyptian nor Hittite, but had been brought into the folds of the two empires for their own good, naturally.

Extradition was next provided for. Persons fleeing from the land of Egypt or from that of the Hittites were to be surrendered upon demand. "But," continues the treaty, "no criminal action is to be raised against them." The houses of such were not to be destroyed, nor their wives and children; nor were they to be slain, nor in any manner mutilated, as by "removing his eyes, or his ears, or his tongue, or his feet." Nothing being said of the man's hands, it is possible that these were exempted. The practice of cutting off hands was quite popular in those days, owing to the lack of penitentiaries in which malefactors could be kept from doing further harm.

The many "forevers" shown in the treaty did not last any too long. A tablet at Medinet Habu in Egypt shows Rameses the Third receiving the severed hands of Hittites slain in battle. Even the marriage of one of the daughters of Kheta-Sar to Rameses the Second, she becoming the favorite wife of the Pharaoh under the name of Neferu-Ra, could not produce

"amity forever" between these two great powers of antiquity. It is unfortunately true that nothing planned by man outlasts his necessities, or what is all too often mistaken for them.

Since then many such treaties have been made, of course. A cursory examination of history shows that since this treaty some 1,500 international engagements of that sort have been entered into and in due time violated. It is well to remember that treaties, like municipal law, depend upon concepts of morality and material considerations that may change overnight, and that peace treaties and alliances are subject to the hazards of human existence. Powers that find it of advantage to hold such agreements sacred do so, of course. Communities that find them a burden in the end lose no time in breaking them. We also point to the fact that governments are not in the habit of making treaties of any sort with groups whom they have subjugated and whom they hope to incorporate permanently in their realm. Treaties are made only with those whose power is not entirely spent, and with those of whose obedience one cannot be sure in the long run. When such covenants are sugared with a promise that revision is to be undertaken sooner or later, the one who imposes the hard conditions of a treaty admits frankly enough, though involuntarily, that he is exacting more than is reasonable. Even the most superficial survey of diplomatic history in ancient and modern times establishes the fact that more wars of conquest were terminated without treaties than with treaties. The conqueror simply took what he wanted, and the conquered waited until their opportunity had come. Whether peace treaties or other agreements, also known as scraps of paper, figured in this process, does not seem to be so very important after all. The principal good that comes from such treaties appears to be a gain for the historian. Generally the causes of wars would have remained a mystery had some peace treaty not afterward disclosed what they were. For instance, there has been much controversy as to the origin of the so-called World War. This and that claim has been advanced; this and that party to the conflict has been held solely or largely responsible for this terrible conflagration, the smoke and soot of which is still in our eyes, and the ashes and dead embers in our shoes.

What that war was fought for is made quite plain by the Treaties of Versailles, St. Germain, Trianon, Neuilly, and Sevres. In those treaties Germany was dismantled, Austria-Hungary dismembered, Bulgaria trimmed down to the bone, and the old Ottoman Empire thrown to the dogs. We have no reason to think that peace treaties imposed by the Central Powers would have been better. The treaty negotiated by Germany with Russia at Brest-Litovsk certainly indicates that the Allied and Associated Governments would have been in a tight jam had the war ended in favor of the Central Powers' group of belligerents.

I cannot agree with those who have said that if Germany had won the war there would have been a more just peace. I do not know of any government which, after a war, would write a just peace. I put them all in the same basket when it comes to writing treaties and playing the game of diplomacy. It is all a poker game, in which they deal from all sides of the table, both the bottom and the top, and behind one another's back.

The plain, unvarnished fact is that governments go to war for a purpose, and this purpose is gain—gain at the expense of the government, country, or people against whom they war. Despite all the treaties made—and they would run into the thousands were all the smaller treaties included—the process of international relations and affairs has always been what I have here indicated.

As already stated, treaties are simply milestones on the roads mankind has traveled. In addition to throwing light upon the status of things that brought them into existence, they record what statesmen, if they were honest about it, thought of matters on a certain day. The moment conditions changed, the attitude toward the treaty was bound to change. We need not take it for granted that deceit invariably played a role in this change. Governments change in personnel and policy, and the public interest of a state is hardly ever the same for long. That treaties are violated,

then, is simply a deplorable incident in the life of nations and governments. However, it is regrettable that in many cases nations and governments continue to see an asset in a treaty that has been rated a liability by the other party. This anomaly appears to have been in the mind of George Washington when he advised this Nation to keep away from entangling alliances, by which he meant, of course, all alliances. It is hardly possible that this far-seeing man overlooked that treaties of any sort, or alliances of any type, are entangling.

That the course of international relations of the United States has been so singularly smooth during the century and a half of the Republic's existence is undoubtedly due to the advice of its first President having been much heeded in the past. Of course, we have had our slants and pet aversions among the nations; undoubtedly there have been many "gentlemen's agreements" that influenced our conduct, but we have in the past steered clear of alliances that would have plunged us into wars not of our own making.

I am not one of those who hold that we would have stayed out of the World War had the principal members of the Central Powers group used a little more common sense in their dealings with the American Government. But we still have every reason to think that it would have been much more difficult, if not entirely impossible, to have dragged us into that war had the enemies of the Allies exercised more judgment from the very beginning. I realize how potent the effect of propaganda can be. On the other hand, it generally takes more than sentiment to induce a people to risk its welfare for the sake of a kindred aggregation of people. In such matters mankind is foolish rather than altruistic.

It is hard to tell at this moment what the near future has in store for the human race. The outlook is poor enough, even if the picture should not be as black as it is painted. The propagandist is busy again. Passion once more is being roused as in the days of the World War, and it is not to be overlooked that this time the interested publicist and propagandist has much more and much better material for his purposes than he had beginning with 1914. It would be very difficult to defend the conduct of certain men in this country.

We have another scrap of paper to refer to, the peace Treaty of Versailles and its associated instruments of the same nature. But with any of these we should not concern ourselves. They never had public recognition in this country. They were rejected along with the Covenant of the League of Nations, of which, fortunately, we never became a member. It would be the very crown of folly for us to grow excited over something we disowned 20 years ago. I say disowned, because those who directly and indirectly took a hand in getting us into the World War were more than willing in 1920 and later to have us scrap Washington's foreign policy in favor of a "holy alliance," the League of Nations, that was more unholy and futile than any other similar effort that preceded it.

Mr. President, we should not overlook that present conditions in Europe and much of the world elsewhere are distinctly the product of the peace treaties, so-called, that ended the World War. The conditions in Germany to which so many object were conceived in the Treaty of Versailles and hatched finally in the harsh treatment given the prematurely born Weimar Republic. Had the high contracting parties of the Treaty of Versailles and the authors and bosses of the League of Nations possessed a little common sense, they would have realized that what this puny infant of a republic in Germany needed was an incubator and not the lash of reparations.

The hateful persecution of minorities now going on in Europe is undoubtedly the fruit of the seeds of hate engendered by the majority at Versailles and spread in the fertile soil of the oppressed minorities by the administration of the treaty. These cruel persecutions we abhor now in others, and rightly so. We do abhor these things as emphatically as the American people and their Representatives in the Senate abhorred and repudiated an effort to make us a party to a covenant of oppression that would threaten western civilization and jeopardize the sovereignty of the United



States. We abhor no less the dictatorship theory of government that makes these purges and religious and civil persecutions possible and are determined that such theories shall not find root on American soil.

Had common sense ruled Versailles, all of mankind would probably have been spared much worry and trouble; billions of dollars spent for armament after a war that was to end war could have been put to better use, as the billions of dollars some want us to spend for war in Europe now could be used to much better advantage than to try to help Europe out of her difficulties. Had that money been spent here, we would have made this country a better place in which to live. Democracy, instead of being now beset by many powerful enemies, would have gained in the German Republic a fine pillar of strength against the wall of bolshevism in eastern Europe. However, there were bitter-enders everywhere to play into the hands of the smart alecks; there was too great an audience that enjoyed seeing the bull in the German arena baited by those who collected the gate receipts of reparations.

The net result was precisely what far-seeing men and women said at the time it would be. With the Weimar Republic discredited, Germany had no choice but to turn to some form of dictatorship. It was simply a question which way to turn—toward communism or fascism, since a return to the monarchy would probably have led to a continuation of the peace Treaty of Versailles by military means, just as the World War was continued in the same treaty by diplomatic means.

Under the same treaty there has been an economic warfare. As a matter of fact, the war really never ceased. While fighting ceased economic war has continued until the present time.

I do not believe it can be successfully denied that the failure to revise the Treaty of Versailles is responsible for the rise to power of Hitler in Germany. The Allied governments and other signatories to the League of Nations had promised revision of the treaty, but failed to do so.

That promise was violated by those who say they are fighting to preserve the sanctity of treaties. The provisions of the treaty imposed on the people of Germany and the suffering enforced created such a condition of suffering among the people that a fertile field was created for the spread of communistic propaganda. The communistic theory of government had made such advancement in Germany that by 1932 the Communists polled about 6,000,000 votes out of a total vote of 35,000,000, in which 12 other political parties competed.

In that election, the National Socialist polled not quite 12,000,000 votes, giving that party in combination with the National Party a majority of the Reichstag, and the union of these two parties for the control of the Reichstag caused President Hindenburg to call Hitler to power as Chancellor. Both the Communist and the National Socialist Parties were pledged to a revision of the Treaty of Versailles, and for fear of communism the other parties combined with the Nazi in opposition to the Communists.

In 1931, when Hindenburg was president, there was a coalition government under Bruening and Dr. Breitscheidt, the social democrats and the center party. Law after law was passed by the Reichstag giving the president more and more power from time to time and authorizing him to issue decrees having the force of law. Of course, the Reichstag passed such legislation giving more and more power to Hindenburg because they knew he was a good man; they knew he would not abuse that power. So delegating more power to the president to meet various crises that might arise, the foundations were laid for Hitler when he came into power to grab the power that had been given to Hindenburg. Because Hindenburg was such a good man, and people trusted him and knew he would not abuse power, they gave him power, but the trouble is that human beings die, even presidents and diplomats, and sometimes they make mistakes. The Reichstag of Germany, in my opinion, made their first mistake when they started to delegate more and more power to President Hindenburg. That was in 1930 and 1931. So we have war in Europe now. Is there a lesson for us here?

Of course, it is easy to look back; but I want to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that from the very beginning there were men, not only in the United States but in France and England, who denounced the Treaty of Versailles and predicted the dire consequences that would follow the enforcement of the treaty. Very distinguished men in England, even some in France, and some in the United States, took that position, but they were not listened to. If these things could have been foreseen by those who would not see and would not listen, the revision of the Treaty of Versailles could easily have been made; and had the allied powers shown an earlier willingness to revise the Treaty of Versailles peacefully, most of Europe's present difficulties might have been avoided. Two years ago such willingness on the part of the Allies was quite apparent when they accepted reoccupation of the Saar Valley and the Rhine frontier. All these changes have been made since Hitler came to power. Had anything like the same willingness to compromise been shown the puny German Republic when it was struggling for its life, it would have gained the prestige so necessary for it to remain in power. With that prestige the crisis which brought the Nazi Party into power would not have occurred.

Diplomats and statesmen must learn that a people cannot be forever coerced, as history many times has proved. Statesmen seem to have never understood that change and growth are a law of life that they cannot repeal.

I deem it necessary to warn my countrymen against lending a willing ear and mind to propaganda that is now being carried on. The Treaty of Versailles had to be broken if it was to be revised. That much is clear; that much was demonstrated by the very governments which now have so much to say on the subject.

After all is said and done, two decades should suffice to show whether or not a treaty is fair or, in the long run, feasible. Moreover, let us not overlook the fact that it was not Germany which first violated the parent covenant of which the Treaty of Versailles is merely the bastard offspring. The conduct of a number of other governments, and of the League of Nations itself, showed the way. Strong members of the League began to make war upon weak members of the League. Of course, we heard protests from the League; but these were incoherent babblings that may have delighted the addicts of the League and their myopic friends, but had no other effect. The League was already a very sick man when the Saar Basin was taken by Germany. It has been under an oxygen tent ever since, unless, indeed, it died at Munich without ado and was surreptitiously buried without the usual certificate—which is also possible in this age of shams.

I have given considerable attention to the League of Nations, because its covenant or charter must be regarded perhaps as the major treaty of alliance of all time. For a while, virtually all governments belonged to it, some of them in defiance of their own laws, as our own, which developed the habit of having "unofficial" observers attend the powwows of the Council and Assembly of the League, not to mention some regular attachés permanently connected with the League in defiance of the views of Congress, which were well known.

Of course, nothing is gained by thinking that in this world any nation can live alone. The more contact we have with the world, the better it is. But that contact should not take the form of alliances, or even understandings between gentlemen who consider themselves above the nation's will expressed in law. What we have had in the happy days of our past, and what we again shall have in the happier days of our future, is the fluid foreign policy of being with all nations on as friendly a footing as circumstances permit. Departing from that rule as early as 1914 has already cost us scores of billions; it will cost us still others when the real pensioning begins; and it will completely hypothecate our future if the mistake is repeated, as is now suggested by so many.

To be sure, no well-defined move for ensnaring us with alliances is in the offing at this moment; but that was true also prior to Easter of 1917. For ways that are dark, and

so forth, some statesmen are very peculiar. Let us bear that fact in mind. Just as we failed to "make the world safe for democracy" by ending the rule of the Hohenzollerns and Hapsburgs, so would we fail in making the world safe for democracy by ending the sway of the dictators. Also, we should give some attention to the several brands of democracy we are being asked to save. Some of them are good; others are not so good. Our own could stand some renovating, I think, considering that we have on our hands some 10,000,000 persons who find it impossible to earn their own living or who cannot be made to do so, and 20,000,000 on relief.

But I began with peace treaties. I will end with them. What are treaties of peace? If they are anything, they are contracts between parties. The signatories are designated as "high contracting parties." How sacred and binding can they be, viewed from the standpoint of law, equity, or morals?

It is a well-established principle in law that a contract signed by either party under coercion and duress is ipso facto null and void. Only force can keep it binding on the party coerced. It cannot be held sacrosanct in equity or morals, nor in the so-called decent respect of the opinions of mankind.

Why prate of the sanctity of such treaties? Because such contracts or treaties are held legal in international law? Such treaties are international law. That being so, why talk about the sanctity of international law? The question answers itself. Treaties of that sort are dangerous. The subject is one on which hair splitting is not in order. To be sure, we had no treaty of alliance in 1917, so far as the record shows; but many of us were so full of maudlin sentimentalism for the Allies that no formal treaty was necessary. I, for one, doubt even today that the Hohenzollern rulers were ever half so dangerous as their present successors or those who will take their places in central Europe if we again assist in choking the international pig with butter. I am thoroughly in favor of letting those who, by their hatred and avarice, lust of power, and what not, produced the present chaos in Europe, find a solution of their own for the problems that now worry them. In holding that view, I am inclined to think that of all alliances the worst is the one that has not been reduced to terms of writing, because it gives to the more astute of the high contracting parties a power which the finest text in diplomatic French cannot engender.

I have already heard a great thundering from the pulpit, platform, and press anent this so-called new epidemic of making scraps of paper of treaties. There are by now large numbers of sane men and women who believe that the Covenants of the League of Nations and its World Court, and the several treaties that ended the World War, were thoroughly bad. In fact it is generally recognized today. Those who opposed our joining the unholy alliance that terminated the World War on the calendar, but not in fact, have something to be proud of. Those who finally threw off the yoke which the Covenant of the League of Nations and associated "peace" treaties placed upon them, have at least the excuse of having seen no signs anywhere that a revision of those treaties was contemplated by those who flattered themselves with the notion that they were still masters of the show. It is most regrettable that blasting the nefarious treaties that followed the war had to be marred by ugly excesses in persecution; but that need not deter us from rejoicing that nothing came of the peace intrigues that were to keep Europe and much of the rest of the world in bondage of policies born of hate and selfishness.

In closing, I should like to say a word for those who still hold that our getting into the League of Nations would have caused that combination to be a success. One still finds people here and there who "hang crepe" because we did not join the League and its World Court. I suppose one can also find persons who still doubt that the earth is a globe instead of a disk borne on the back of four elephants.

It would be vain to speculate as to what the possibilities would have been had we joined the League, and thus underwritten every treaty of peace and alliance concocted under its

auspices. I shall not waste your time with that. As a major power the United States itself might not have fared so badly. However, we may well doubt that we could have prevented the many violations of the League Covenant of which members of the League have become guilty in the past 10 years. We should have been obliged either to tolerate or to condemn the international banditry that has been going on. Standing supinely by would have cost us a great deal of self-respect, while doing something about it probably would have precipitated us into another expensive war for the benefit of those whose position in the League enabled them to produce almost any situation that fitted into their schemes of furthering their own public interest.

We are holding the bag for nearly \$12,000,000,000 now. That bag probably would be much greater had the urge of well-intentioned but poorly informed idealists again caused us to think more of meaningless treaties than of the exigencies of human life. If international relations can be compared to a barrel made of staves, I am more for gluing the thing than for encircling it with strong steel hoops. The greater the pressure in any container, the worse the explosion when the limit is reached.

To those who look but cannot see—to those who see in Communist and Fascist absolutism nothing more than the perversity of mankind and its masters—it probably is not yet clear that without the World War and its most regrettable results dictatorship of the odious types which now offend them would not have come into being.

We might just as well see this thing as it is. Also, we need not take too seriously this tom-tom thumping concerning the world's remaining democracies. We have recently heard a great deal of democracy in the Western Continent. I suppose we shall hear more of it. In my opinion, democracy anywhere is only relative. These efforts at making the Western Continent seem the very cradle of democracy in these days rather amuse me. Of the so-called democracies, an amazing number in this hemisphere are governed either by a revolutionary family or a political junta. Nor would I maintain without some reserve that the United States, the British Empire, and France and her vast colonial realm are just too democratic for words. I doubt very much that such is the case. Their so-called treaty rights covering concessions in China cannot stand investigation of their origin, purpose, or moral foundation. I am sure you cannot fool the man in the street with that theory so long as he stays away from the influence of both liquor and propaganda.

A contract was signed by our Allied democracies to pay their war debts. This contract was signed, not under duress but on their own terms and of their own free will. If international agreements have any right to be called sacred, as some persons insist, this contract for payment of debts, signed by democratic governments, should be doubly sacred. However, they were dishonored by default. I suppose this was done on the assumption that democracies can do no wrong.

I have touched upon a good many things, because the time may soon be here again when other scraps of paper will fill the air and blind the spectators. We have already been called upon to go to war because one Hitler tore up the "peace" Treaty of Versailles; and this call has come on the ground that all treaties are nothing short of sacred. If that be the case, let us by all means begin this latest crusade of ours by making the rulers of Egypt and Kheta live up to the solemn agreement they made some 4,200 years ago and kept for 40 years. Let us be thorough in this thing by beginning at the beginning.

On the other hand, should this course of action prove impossible to our modern but anciently orthodox diplomats, is it not possible and practicable for them to pursue a diplomatic course to the end that revision or readjustment can be made by peaceful negotiation, as was promised even by those who wrote the Versailles Treaty, and other treaties based on it? An effort has been made in this direction by European statesmen until recently. This seems to have enraged some of our peace advocates, who seem to favor war in order to prevent war. Exchange of billingsgate, of the kind which in this country, as well as others at times, has been on an export



basis, is not conducive to peaceful relations and the sympathetic understanding so necessary to the will to peace.

Peaceful readjustment may cost something. It is certainly worth whatever it costs if the alternative is world war, and the price the sacrifice of our civilization.

Mr. President, in conclusion, and for the purpose of the record, because so much has been said about returning to international law. I desire to quote from Judge Loder, an expert on international law, as I think all will agree. Judge Loder was a Hollander like Grotius. He wrote the constitution for the League of Nations court. He was its first president. He served as president of that court for 3 years, then resigned. I asked him why he resigned. He said he resigned because he had tried to make that court a judicial tribunal, but had failed; that he could not make it a judicial tribunal. He said it was a political tribunal. At the time he told me this he pointed out that the court had taken jurisdiction of the question of the German-Austrian Anschluss in 1931. He said that was a political question, and that a judicial tribunal should not have entered upon and taken jurisdiction of a political controversy.

I asked Judge Loder some questions about international law. He said: "International law changes from time to time. It is a policy. It is not a fixed statute, and it is changed from time to time by those who have the power to change it, whenever it is necessary to do so."

In view of so much being said about international law and the sanctity of treaties in this debate, and on account of so much talk about justice and morality between nations, I desire to quote what Judge Loder gave me as his opinion of justice between nations, and international law. I asked him whether he thought international questions could be solved judicially. He said, "It will never come in your time or mine." I said, "Why?" He said, "Because there cannot be justice and sovereignty inhabiting the same sphere." When we have sovereignty dispensing justice, according to Judge Lauder—and he is right—we cannot expect to have exact justice in international law, any more than we can have it in any other kind of law.

There is one thing statesmen forget, and it is one thing we ought to remember. Life is just a law that is constantly changing, and as poor victims of the changing forces of the universe, we are thrown around from pillar to post because we are nothing but human beings, and, God help us, we must so remain until further notice. But for the life of me I cannot see how we can do the United States or the world any good by mixing in the controversy now going on in Europe. With 20,000,000 people on relief, and something like eight or ten million out of work, it seems to me that the best thing we can do for democracy is to try to make it work here, to show as an example to the world that it can be made to work, and so show people who are living under tyranny, under dictatorships, that there is a better mode of life. It seems to me that in order to do this we must act very soon, because if we do not, I believe we cannot be of much aid to democracy or the peace of the world, and I do not think we can do it by entering another World War. It is my opinion that if we do, and the war goes to a finish, there will be no democracy left, there will be more suffering than now, there will be many times the number of debts, more persecution of minorities, and less civil and religious liberty. I do not believe we can save democracy by a war of extermination even though it is labeled a war to prevent a war of extermination.

Mr. GILLETTE obtained the floor.

Mr. BROWN. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUNDEEN in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Bilbo	Byrnes	Connally
Andrews	Borah	Capper	Danaher
Austin	Bridges	Caraway	Davis
Bailey	Brown	Chandler	Donahey
Bankhead	Bulow	Chavez	Downey
Barbour	Burke	Clark, Idaho	Ellender
Barkley	Byrd	Clark, Mo.	Frazier

George	Johnson, Calif.	Neely
Gibson	Johnson, Colo.	Norris
Gillette	King	Nye
Green	La Follette	O'Mahoney
Guffey	Lee	Overton
Gurney	Lodge	Pepper
Hale	Lucas	Pittman
Harrison	Lundeen	Radcliffe
Hatch	McCarran	Reed
Hayden	McKellar	Reynolds
Herring	McNary	Russell
Hill	Maloney	Schwartz
Holman	Miller	Schwellenbach
Holt	Minton	Sheppard
Hughes	Murray	Shipstead

Slattery
Stewart
Taft
Thomas, Okla.
Thomas, Utah
Townsend
Truman
Tydings
Vandenberg
Van Nuys
Wagner
Wheeler
Wiley

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BROWN in the chair). Eighty-six Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I will say to those Senators who have just come into the Chamber and are waiting for an opportunity to speak, and to those who have business elsewhere and of more importance, that I expect to speak for about 30 minutes, and possibly 40, and no longer.

Mr. President, during my limited experience in the Congress, both upon the other side of the Capitol and upon this side, I have made it a practice not to interject myself or my opinions into the debate on the floor unless I felt that I had something of real importance to contribute, being rather content to do what work I could in the committees and follow the leadership of the outstanding men on the floor in casting the suffrage that has been entrusted to me. Nor would I depart from that practice today with any thought in mind of making a contribution which might influence my colleagues in determining their action with reference to the pending question, but I feel impelled to speak for two reasons: First, because of a pledge to which I shall refer a little later, but principally because I have been greatly disturbed, as I am sure millions of other Americans have, over the development in the past few weeks of what might be designated a war psychology, a war hysteria, which may or may not reach a momentum that will have serious consequences in this country.

A few weeks ago, following the wise pronouncement of the President, people were saying, "We are not going to get into this war." Now they are saying, "I hope we can keep out of this war. I hope we will not be forced into the war."

Mr. President, this country of ours is conceded everywhere to be a peace-loving nation, and, except for one instance, of which we are not proud, every war in which we have engaged from the beginning of our history has been a war for what we conceived to be ideals, with altruistic purposes. But, notwithstanding that attitude on the part of the united people, notwithstanding the antagonism we have to war, the fact remains that since the beginning of our history there has not passed over our heads one generation—counting a generation as 20 to 25 years—in which we have not been engaged in war. Why is it necessary for a people which abhors war as we do to be drawn into it for one reason or for another? What is the explanation?

I may be pardoned if I refer briefly to my own personal experience. Over 40 years ago, as a young man under 20, after the sinking of the *Maine* in Habana harbor and the killing of 265 or 266 American sailors, I took part in the tirade of abuse of President McKinley, then occupying the White House, because he tried to hold the American people in leash and to prevent the outbreak of war. That abuse attained such proportions by the following April that, notwithstanding it tore the heart out of William McKinley, he was forced into war because of the emotions, the prejudices, and the attitude and the psychology of the American people.

Twenty years later, approximately, I again found my war spirit boiling, and I joined in my poor way in the cacophony of abuse of President Woodrow Wilson because he was "dilatatory" in taking the leadership and bringing us into the World War. I said, as no doubt scores of other citizens were heard to say: "Wilson will write another note, as he did to Mexico. He says he is too proud to fight. If we had Theodore Roosevelt in the White House, we would have been in Belgium 2 years ago." I contributed my part to that sentiment and

helped force the hand of President Wilson. The American people demanded war because they wanted war.

Now it is 20 years later. I have reached a point and age where my war blood is not boiling, although today, if it were necessary, I would go into war; I would pledge the services of my boy if it were necessary. But I can see and I can hear and I can feel the psychology that is developing throughout the country. It is contributed to, probably unintentionally—I hope there is no one with soul so dead as to do it intentionally—but whether intentionally or not, there is developing that attitude and feeling on the part of the American people, and we should do something here to change it, to stop it.

Personally, I think the greatest contribution we could make to the country at the present time would be to act on the pending measure in some way as soon as possible. Therefore, I thought I might say something concerning the foundation on which we have reared the structure of so-called neutrality legislation which might be helpful in reassuring the country insofar as I could do so in my very limited way.

Mr. President, in 1917 and 1918 several million American boys were sent abroad to European battlefields. Other millions at home contributed in their way to that war which we were waging together with our Allies in Europe. I do not care what assertions are carelessly made by those who say we were "sold" into the war or that we were dragged into the war; I know that was not the attitude of the men who were participating in the war. They thought they were fighting a "war to end war." We were told that there was a possibility of the Central Powers winning, and that unless we went over there and helped win the war we might have to fight them over here, and that we were going "to make the world safe for democracy."

Let me speak for these boys. It was my duty over in France to read the mail of hundreds and hundreds of these American boys. I know what they wrote home to mother and to wife and to sweetheart and sister. I know that some of it was interspersed with profanity. I know that some of them could not spell. I know that much of it was ungrammatical. But I know that the burden of the letters written home was, "We are making a tremendous sacrifice in order that this dreadful experience may never again have to be undergone by American boys and American girls. I am willing to go through this and make the supreme sacrifice if necessary."

And in reading that mail, Mr. President, I made a pledge on my knees that as long as I drew the breath of life I would never let any opportunity pass for keeping faith with those young men.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I was over there with the Senator from Iowa, and I had much the same experience. I had the same feeling and emotion the Senator from Iowa experienced. And I have the feeling now that the reason why we did not make the world safe for democracy is because we ran out on our pledge to the men who went over in 1917 and 1918. If we had not turned our backs upon the League of Nations, but had set up some machinery to maintain the peace of the world, we would not be in the mess we are in today.

Mr. GILLETTE. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Indiana. And I may say that I am in accord with his view and will refer to it very shortly.

The millions who came back to America and the millions who were here had in their hearts and on their lips two words over and over again repeated, "Never again. Never again. Never again." And that is the burden of what is in the hearts of the American people today. But notwithstanding that unanimity of opinion and hope and aspiration, there was difference of opinion as to how the desire could be attained.

In the first place, we have sought to maintain what we called the freedom of the seas under international law; and we fought four wars—the undeclared war with France, the war with the Barbary pirates, the War of 1812, and the war of 1917—to maintain the so-called freedom of the seas. What we call international law, the volume of precedents

which are flouted and thrown aside when the national interests of any contestant suggest it, was not effective in keeping us out of war. It was evident to the American people that we would have to do something else.

If I may use a homely illustration, suppose I live out in Chevy Chase, with a little boy 10 years old. If on his way to school two of my neighbors were shooting at each other across the street, what good would it do for me to say, "I am an American citizen. My little boy is entitled to go to school. I am a taxpayer. I support that school. Go out there, son, and go right up that street." It would be ridiculous to maintain such an attitude.

The American people knew that they would have to maintain some sort of policy other than reliance on international law, and two schools of thought immediately developed. One of them maintained that neutrality could be secured by international cooperation, coordination, and action. I belonged to that school then; I belong to it now; and I believe ultimately that school will come into the ascendancy in the thought of the Nation.

The other school of thought says, "That is the very antithesis of neutrality. It makes us automatically a party to every dispute in Europe or Asia, whether we want to be or not. We cannot participate unless we are willing to go the whole length. Consequently, you cannot develop any thought that is more unneutral in its effect and purpose than international cooperation."

That school of thought had the support of a large majority of the American people; and in 1920 the American people went to the polls and cast a ballot between the two schools of thought. The one which I supported was overwhelmingly defeated. That expression of the people then became a mandate from the people on the Congress of the United States to translate into law a national system of neutrality which would be effective against our involvement in future wars.

One of the saddest commentaries on the Government of the United States—on you, my Democratic colleagues, and you, my Republican friends—is that for 15 years after you received that mandate not only was a system of national neutrality not evolved, but, so far as I know, no measure to carry out that view, that plan, and that philosophy was even introduced in the Congress of the United States.

In August 1935, when I happened to be a member of the Foreign Affairs Committee of the House, the first comprehensive plan of national neutrality legislation was proposed.

Mr. President, I may say today some things that hurt, but they are from my heart. It is said that there were peculiar coincidences. Perhaps the thing to which I shall now refer is a coincidence, but if it was a coincidence it was the first of a long series of the most remarkable coincidences that history records of action proposed in the United States parallel with action taken by certain foreign countries.

At that time Italy and Ethiopia were engaged in war—an undeclared war so far as Italy was concerned. England feared for her life-line through the Mediterranean. England, through the League of Nations as it was then constituted, proposed the imposition of sanctions on Italy because of her conflict in Ethiopia; and Italy did not care a snap of her finger. The things that were vital to her were oil, gasoline, and motor fuel; and she could turn, and did turn, to the United States.

Then the proposal was made—and I know what I am talking about, Mr. President—that in our neutrality law, which then had a hearing, we limit the amount of gasoline that might be purchased in this country by a belligerent to the percentage of motor fuel which that belligerent purchased in peace time, which in Italy's case was 6 percent.

We were notified that if we passed that type of legislation Italy would consider it tantamount to a declaration of war. Let me quote from the esteemed chairman of our Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN] on April 19, 1937, on this very matter:

For instance, during the Italo-Ethiopian war Mussolini declared that the placing of an embargo by the League of Nations upon the export of oil to Italy would be deemed not only an unneutral but an unfriendly act, attended with grave consequences. In fact, he



clearly indicated that he would consider such an embargo a *casus belli*. At the time this matter was under consideration by the League of Nations, when the President indicated that he was considering bringing about an embargo upon the export of oil to both of the belligerents, Mussolini communicated to our Government that he would consider such an act both unneutral and unfriendly. This whole incident was packed with the most sensitive explosives of imminent war.

And we backed up and rewrote the Neutrality Act.

At that time there was a marked difference of opinion among Members of Congress as to whether we should have a mandatory embargo or whether we should have a discretionary embargo. Those who were in Congress at that time will recall the difference of opinion. The American people were convinced that if we were to have a national system of neutrality it would have to take into consideration four factors which, rightly or wrongly, were considered as having influenced our drifting into the last war.

The first was the travel of American citizens on belligerent ships, such as the *Lusitania*.

The second was the sale of munitions.

The third was the extension of credit of belligerent nations.

The fourth element was the chances American citizens took in trying to run blockades established under international law by other nations.

The neutrality law which we finally put on the books appeared to take into consideration those elements which we thought had militated against us in forcing us or urging us or influencing us into the war.

The result was the Neutrality Act of August 1935, which we put on the statute books, and which was a compromise between the mandatory-embargo people and the discretionary-embargo people. Some of us League of Nations men, the international-cooperation men, said then, as we say now, "It will never work because it cannot be effective equally. We are willing to go along and help you write a neutrality act that will attain the goal which you hope it will attain. We will do everything possible to write into the law that sort of provision and that sort of element. We will go along with you"; and we did. But within 2 years we amended the act twice in very vital particulars, and we are now proposing to amend it again. I venture to prophesy—nobody cares what my prophecies may be, but I venture to prophesy—that it will be back in Congress. No legislation for national neutrality can be so written that it will apply equally under all circumstances to all conceivable belligerents. It cannot be done.

Then we wrote into the law what is euphemistically called the cash-and-carry provision. Some of us then maintained, as has been maintained so forcefully on this floor, that there is no logic in embargoing the shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to a belligerent and selling the same belligerent the scrap iron, steel, and cotton which are necessary in their manufacture.

In my opinion, that argument is absolutely irrefutable. It cannot be controverted.

When that provision was written into law, where was the eloquence of the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. PITTMAN]? Where were the scintillating pyrotechnics of the junior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY]? Where was the disarming candor of the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE]? Where was the calm persuasiveness of the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS]? Where was the cool, incisive, and almost convincing logic of the Senator from Washington [Mr. SCHWELLENBACH]?

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. SCHWELLENBACH. If the Senator will take the time to read my remarks in 1937, I think he will understand where I was. I very frankly stated that I was voting for the joint resolution because it was the overwhelming opinion of the Congress that it would be of some help in keeping us out of war, but that I did not believe it would, and that I believed that in 2 years we would be back amending it.

Mr. GILLETTE. I am very, very glad to learn that I was mistaken in the instance of the Senator from Washington and to know that he took that position.

But where was the flaming steel of the musketeer from the Wabash, the Hoosier d'Artagnan, at that time? With the exception of the Senator from Washington, every one of the men whom I have mentioned was joining in approval of the so-called cash-and-carry provision, which would prohibit, after the President had so proclaimed, the shipment of these other materials that might be utilized in war except after divesting ourselves of title.

In that connection I should like to quote again from the Senator from Nevada, chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, who said in the same speech to which I have referred:

No one has seriously opposed the imposition of an embargo upon the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to belligerents.

Mr. President, I have been considerably exercised over the "boxing of the compass" done by a good many editorial writers and columnists in expressing opinions on this matter, and I am going to take the liberty of quoting from a well-known columnist—I will even go so far as to mention her name—Miss Dorothy Thompson. I may say, not with reference to Miss Thompson alone but to others, that they may be described by the couplet of Hall Caine:

He sits in a sea-green grotto, with a bucket of lurid paint,  
And he paints things as they isn't, for the god of things as they ain't.

Miss Dorothy Thompson said:

Under its terms wartime commerce is rigged in favor of the great monopolies, international industries, and international banking houses, as against the smaller manufacturer who keeps his capital and employs his labor at home. The bill also will extend to the President very great power of deciding anywhere in the world what constitutes a state of war. \* \* \* The bill, furthermore, definitely favors, in wartime—

Now, listen—

definitely favors, in wartime, that country or those countries which can control the sea, extending to it or to them special privileges which other belligerents cannot enjoy. It also extends special privileges to those nations, or their nationals, who hold credits in this country, or operate industries or exploit natural resources here. The bill is called a neutrality law.

It is not a neutrality law.

Now, what does this bill actually mean in practice? First of all, it means that we are flagrantly reversing the attitude expressed in the Kellogg Pact, which denounces aggression. We, the greatest, strongest single nation on earth, announce by inference that there is no such thing as "right" or "wrong" among nations and no such thing as international morality. In advance of all possible hostilities we perform the greatest Pontius Pilate act in history.

We are proposing to reenact that law, and Miss Thompson, I believe, is ardently supporting it. I have no objection to her supporting it or to her or anyone else changing opinion on the matter, but I wish to digress here to call attention to some statements in the debate on this floor in which the illogic of the position of checking the sale of materials has been referred to, particularly as being inimical to the weaker nations and helping the aggressors.

There is nothing we can put on the statute books that is more unfair to a victim of aggressors than the so-called cash and carry which is now proposed. If it had been in effect at the time of the Italian-Ethiopian war, Ethiopia could not have gotten anything, whereas Italy could have obtained anything she wanted.

If it had been in effect when Germany first invaded Poland, Germany could have gotten anything she wanted, and Poland could not have obtained a thing. If it had been in effect at the time Czechoslovakian rights were infringed, Germany could have gotten anything she wanted and Czechoslovakia could have gotten nothing. If it should be enacted into law now, Latvia, Estonia, and Rumania and none of the other weaker states could get a thing.

Further than that, if it becomes a law after the proclamation of the President, it will be put into effect against China by a declaration of war by Japan. If that should happen, China could not get one solitary thing because she has no

factories in which to manufacture and fabricate war materials. It would shut her off from the one source she now has.

Incidentally, I may call attention to the fact that there is now on the high seas traveling from a port on the Pacific coast an American ship carrying Dodge trucks and Curtiss airplanes to the Chinese. One such ship has already docked, and the one to which I refer is on its way. If the pending joint resolution had been the law and a state of war had been proclaimed, that shipment could not have been made.

Nothing greater by way of premium could be paid to an aggressor than the enactment of this measure.

The candor of some of our colleagues is refreshing. I have seen a kaleidoscopic phantasmagoria of suggestions as to attitudes toward the present war in Europe. Several proclaim that nothing is further from our intention than to pass an act in the interest of Great Britain and France. Others, such as my friend at my right from Nebraska [Mr. BURKE] and my estimable friend from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], who coached me for the first few months I was in this House, very frankly say they favor the pending measure because it will be of assistance to Great Britain and France. No such purpose should animate anyone—and I say that in all fairness to the Senators to whom I have referred. I know how sincere and earnest they are. The fact remains, however, that some are trying to write a law for the one definite purpose of assisting some nation or nations other than the United States. As the Senator from Nebraska suggested, in response to my question to him, he hoped that that would not be the case, but he was thinking of present circumstances and the effect on the people of Europe. What of the effect on millions of noncombatant men, women, and children in China in the horrible war that is continuing there? Whether we intend it so or not, the pending measure will be applied there.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, if it is not agreeable, but I have been greatly impressed and greatly moved by him, and I merely want to bring his attention to the Ethiopian war, and to remind him that Haile Selassie was not crying out against the cash-and-carry plan. The thing he was crying out against was the embargo. He said "you placed these embargoes on, and they operate in favor of the man who is coming down here with a stiletto at my throat, and I cannot get a gun with which to defend myself." He was crying out not against cash and carry but against the embargo.

Mr. GILLETTE. I was not familiar with that, and I am glad the Senator has suggested it. I know, however, in the State Department and in the Foreign Relations Committee of the House that the message was presented to us that Italy would consider it tantamount to a declaration of war, and we receded on that account.

Mr. President, I said that I would take 40 minutes. I have taken longer possibly than that, although I have not followed the clock as, perhaps, I should have done.

One Senator asked me before I rose to my feet if I was going to speak for or against the bill, and I told him "yes." [Laughter.] Some of the genial young men in the press gallery have been very insistent, as have radio commentators, in calling me and asking me whether I was for or against the repeal of the embargo. Answer "yes" or "no." These gentlemen are always energetic and always enterprising and sometimes even thoughtful in the matter, although not often. Those questions cannot be answered by me now. If I am asked if I will support the measure as an aid to England, France, and the democracies against Hitler, I will say, "I will not." If I am asked if I will vote for it to get us partly into war and to keep us from fighting a future war, I say "I will not." If I am asked, "Will you vote for it to stop Hitlerism?" my reply is "I will not."

Mr. BURKE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. BURKE. If the joint resolution clearly would help China resist the aggressions of Japan, then would the Senator support it?

Mr. GILLETTE. I would not.

Mr. BURKE. That is very definite, I think.

Mr. GILLETTE. But if I am asked, "will you support the joint resolution because you believe it will give the United States of America greater security against future involvement than the present law," I will say, "I will." That is where I stand; that is the only question in my mind; and the final form of the joint resolution will determine it. I believe, that it has elements of greater security.

Perhaps I am in the position of the Shakespearean character who said:

A plague o' both your houses.

Nevertheless, I cannot follow the logic of my colleagues here who say, "We must repeal the present embargo and then put on these other restrictive measures"; nor can I, in all candor and seriousness, follow the logic of my friends over there who say, "It is absolutely necessary to retain the embargo before we do anything else." I cannot follow them.

Let me use another homely illustration. In my State we used to have prairie; and in an early day the settler had to protect his plowed ground and his crops from the grazing animals. Later, we passed a law which said, "You men with cattle will have to put up a lawful fence. A three-wire fence is a lawful fence. You will have to put up a fence of that kind and restrain your cattle." But later, as we developed out there, it was found that the hogs got out, and did more damage than the cattle did. Then we proposed an amendment to the law to make it "hog-tight," and requiring a hog-tight fence to be erected as well as a three-wire fence. What sense would there be, Mr. President, in taking a position in which we cannot make the law hog-tight by putting a 24-inch wire here and leaving the three wires there? Or what sense would there be, let me ask my dear friends on the other side, in saying, "We must retain the other act, regardless of what is put on it?"

I cannot go along with either. I am interested in knowing whether the measure that we enact into law at the conclusion of this debate and the action of the House will go further toward keeping faith with my comrades to whom I have pledged my poor efforts than that which is on the statute books at the present time.

Now I desire to direct attention to two amendments in connection with the joint resolution. If they are enacted into law, if they are embodied in the joint resolution and it is not changed in any other serious respect, I will support it.

The first has reference to the cash-and-carry provision. An eloquent and able columnist, who has a large following, said that the pending measure will prohibit the sale of a toothbrush by an American citizen to a citizen of a belligerent except for cash on the barrel head. He said it in an article in which he purported to explain the joint resolution. He said it was high time that the confusion in the minds of the public should be dissipated, and in the article he made the statement that not even a toothbrush could be sold to a citizen of a belligerent except for cash. There is no provision of that nature in the joint resolution. The joint resolution simply says, practically reenacting the language of the old cash-and-carry provision which expired May 1, that no articles shall be transported from this country until we have divested ourselves of the title to a foreign nation, a foreign corporation, a foreign company, or a foreign individual. There is no suggestion of cash, no limitation on credit from 5 to 50 years or any amount of credit the purchaser can secure; but in the section relating to financial transactions there is a prohibition of the extension of credit beyond the 90-day period to a government, a subdivision of a government, or an agent of a government. In the joint resolution, from one end to the other, there is not a single thing that will prevent the Vickers Co. from sending over here and buying a million rifles in their individual capacity and getting all the credit they want. We may say to them, "You are going to



resell them to the British Empire?" "Why, yes; that is our intention, but for profit. We are not acting as agents of the Government. We are acting for profit."

The first amendment I propose is to close up that loophole, through which, as I see it, a furniture truck could be driven, so as to limit the extension of credit to persons other than agents of foreign governments; to prohibit private concerns from coming over here and buying on unlimited credit, for resale, arms, ammunition, and implements of war from which we have raised the embargo, if that shall be the outcome. If my amendment is adopted they can still buy materials that have peace uses under the provisions of the joint resolution, but the transaction will be limited to a cash transaction. A government, or the agent of a government, may still have 90-day credit.

The second proposal I have offered by way of amendment, which I think will materially improve the joint resolution and close another door, relates to the prohibition contained in the last neutrality law, and which is practically reenacted in almost the same language in this one, in the section referring to financial transactions, prohibiting the flotation and sale in this country of the securities of a foreign government, based on one of the four points to which I referred a while ago which we thought involved us in the last war, namely that by dealing in the securities of one of the belligerents we have a financial stake in its solvency which might induce us to take sides. I do not think it is so, but that is the plan behind the legislation.

At present there is a prohibition which makes it unlawful to sell or float in this country the securities of a foreign nation or subdivision thereof issued after the date of the President's proclamation. Of course, the obvious purpose of that limitation is to avoid confiscation. If one has a vested interest in a security, he ought not to be placed in a position in which it is unlawful to dispose of it. But there is nothing in that provision which prohibits the Government of England, the Government of Germany, the Government of France, or the government of any other belligerent from issuing a new series of bonds after the date of the proclamation, and calling in from their own nationals or from Argentina or some other country bonds of a former issue, with the bait of an increased interest rate, or something of that kind, and using them as a basis for transactions in this country.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. Surely.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator knows about the Johnson Act, does he not?

Mr. GILLETTE. Surely.

Mr. PITTMAN. No bonds or other securities of Great Britain, France, or Italy have been floated in this country since the passage of the Johnson Act, have they?

Mr. GILLETTE. I think that is true.

Mr. PITTMAN. What securities has the Senator in mind that might be renewed?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator from Nevada that I am not in a position to list any securities. I am simply saying that if there were outstanding in the Argentine, in Brazil, or among the British commonwealths, securities of belligerents which had been issued prior to the date of the Presidential proclamation, there is nothing to prevent the issuance or flotation of a new group of securities to purchase the older ones and using the older ones as the basis of transactions here in the very way that belligerent nations are definitely and directly prohibited under the joint resolution from using a new issue here. Whether or not that would be done, I do not know; but I want to close every door. The amendment I have offered would prohibit that unless an American citizen had secured and held a vested interest in the security prior to that date.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, this measure deals only with belligerents, does it not? Does the Senator want to deal with neutrals?

Mr. GILLETTE. Oh, no.

Mr. PITTMAN. As a matter of fact, the Johnson Act absolutely stopped the flotation in this country of any more bonds and other securities—

Mr. GILLETTE. In the case of the nations indebted to us; yes.

Mr. PITTMAN. By all of the countries now involved as belligerents.

Mr. GILLETTE. It does not blanket in every nation that might be involved.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would the Senator object to the British Government paying the debt it now owes us?

Mr. GILLETTE. On the contrary, I should very highly approve of it.

Mr. PITTMAN. Would not the Senator want the matter left open, so that they could adjust the debt if they wanted to do so?

Mr. GILLETTE. I will say to the Senator that that is a noble motive and a consummation devoutly to be wished, but I am afraid it is altogether too fanciful for my conception.

Mr. PITTMAN. Then the Senator would want to say that there could be no adjustment by any belligerent of debts which accrued prior to the Presidential proclamation?

Mr. GILLETTE. I certainly would have no intention of doing anything of the kind.

Mr. PITTMAN. What does the Senator mean to say?

Mr. GILLETTE. Neither do I believe that the proposal I have offered by way of amendment would do that; and, of course, I expect to present it more fully when it is called up on the floor.

I started to refer to this subject just before the Senator from Nevada came into the Chamber, and said there were two amendments that I expected to call up for debate and consideration by the Senate. I will say to the distinguished chairman of my committee that if there is any vital objection to either one I shall be glad to know it and to recede from my position.

Mr. PITTMAN. The clause to which I think the Senator has reference, which was adopted at the time of the Johnson Act, if I recollect aright—it certainly was included in the 1937 act—provided that the prohibition against extending further credits or floating obligations should not apply to the adjustment of prior debts.

Of course we had in mind the fact that there were debts incurred prior to that time—in fact, the ancient war debts—which some of us would like to adjust. We should be glad even if the debtors would admit their liability by the issuance of new instruments. We did not want to foreclose the possibility of collecting several billion dollars in our effort to make the debtors pay cash from now on. I think we are making them pay cash from now on, so far as the Government is concerned, particularly by virtue of the amendment which I offered earlier in the day, striking out any discretionary power whatever. We are doing that, I think; and I do not believe the debtors can get around it by any subterfuge of which I am aware.

Of course, if the Senator wants that provision to apply to nationals of the debtor countries, that involves another question. In that event the provision would apply to the purchase of our cotton and our wheat. That is a question on which the Senator can speak more ably than I can.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator from Nevada, the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations. I will say again that I have offered the amendment in all good faith and in the belief, as a friend of the pending measure, and in the hope that it will close up what I conceive to be a hole in the joint resolution. If there is no hole there, I am merely deluded.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Iowa yield?

Mr. GILLETTE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. So far as the war debts are concerned, I think it should be said that neither the Johnson Act nor the pending joint resolution, in my judgment, changes the act of Congress under which the war debts were refunded. It is provided that there can be no readjustment, and no acceptance of a smaller amount than that carried on the face of the obligations, without the consent of Congress. So that neither the war-debt act nor under the proposed act could anybody except Congress by an act of its own agree to accept a smaller amount or to readjust the debts again. Therefore,

I do not think the question of the war debts need enter into anyone's fears with respect to either the Johnson Act or the pending joint resolution.

Mr. GILLETTE. I thank the Senator, and I hope what he has said is accurate. That, of course, will be a factor in determining the question when the amendments are presented.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I do not want to consume any of the Senator's time, but I do desire to ask one question.

Mr. GILLETTE. I gladly yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator was saying that unless his amendment was adopted foreign governments which have outstanding obligations, as in the Argentine, or elsewhere, would issue new bonds and take up the old ones. How would that help?

Mr. GILLETTE. They could use the old bonds. There is no prohibition against using anything, except an issue of a date after the date of the proclamation.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assumed the Senator was going to make that answer.

Mr. GILLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. CONNALLY. What prevents their now selling the old bonds, in the Argentine or wherever they are, and getting the cash and using that?

Mr. GILLETTE. Nothing whatever.

Mr. CONNALLY. So what good would the Senator's amendment do? If they have an old bond and it is of any value, they can sell it, in the Argentine or in any other neutral country, and take the cash and bring it here and buy the goods. So how would preventing their exchanging new bonds for old bonds meet that point?

Mr. GILLETTE. It is as clear to me as the sunlight. The whole purpose of the legislation proposed is to prevent our holding securities and dealing in securities of a belligerent, and having a vested interest in the solvency of the belligerent. If it is cash which is coming into our hands, we have no interest in the solvency of a belligerent.

As I stated, I have taken more time than I had agreed to. I desire to close with this statement: No one abhors fascism, and the philosophies and ideologies of Europe similar to that school, any more than I do; but no matter how abhorrent the ideologies of Hitlerism and similar schools, no matter how abhorrent they are to me, no matter how noble the supposed ideals of their opponents, there is nothing more abhorrent to me than the sacrifice of American youth, and there is no nobler or loftier ideal than the preservation of American interests and American security. My vote on the joint resolution—and I am hoping to support it—will be gaged on this and this alone. Does it give promise of greater security than the present act?

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I am opposed to the United States taking any part in the present European war. It is not our war. I am opposed to our taking the first step toward participation in this war, which is not our war. I am emphatically opposed to repeal of the arms embargo. It seems to me there is only one reason that can be offered for repeal of the embargo, and that is a desire to make us unneutral. Repeal of the embargo unquestionably means involvement in the European controversy; it is the first step toward war. That is the main reason why I am opposed to repeal of the embargo against sale and shipment of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to nations at war. I may add that, on principle, I am opposed also to the sale of this merchandise of death to other nations at any time; but that is not the question now before the Senate.

I do not want the United States dragged into the war, or bribed into the war with "cash and carry at a profit," or led into the war by the mistaken enthusiasm of some of our own leaders.

There is just one safe place for the United States in this war and that is in the United States. I am convinced the surest way for us to keep out of involvement is to stay on our own ground and mind our own business, and selling arms, ammunition, and implements of war to be used in this war is not staying at home and minding our own business.

Pin most of the proponents of arms-embargo repeal down to what they really want—outside of a comparatively few,

and they are so few that I do not believe in taking them into consideration in discussing this matter—pin these honest, sincere and frequently jittery proponents down in this matter and they will say they want us to sell munitions of war so we can help the Allies.

Helping the Allies, Mr. President, when the Allies are at war is not the road to our remaining at peace. If our help is to be effective, it must be delivered in sufficient quantities and with sufficient force to assure a victory for the Allies.

If we start helping the Allies by so-called methods short of war, and the time comes when the Allies need more than methods short of war, then we must go the limit and supply more than materials for cash. We will be called upon, under those circumstances, to furnish credits, to furnish billions of dollars of loans, which past experience tells us will not be loans, but gifts, and, worst of all, we must furnish also men.

As I see it, Mr. President, and as I believe the majority of our own people see it, and as the nations of Europe see it, repeal of the arms embargo will be taken to mean that we are preparing to cast our lot with Britain and France in this European war.

At this point I give full credit to President Roosevelt for telling Congress and the people exactly what he had in mind when he called Congress in extraordinary session for the purpose of enacting the legislation now before the Senate.

"Repeal of the embargo and a return to international law are the crux of this issue," President Roosevelt declared in his message. To that extent I think he stated the issue correctly.

Mr. President, I am opposing primarily the proposed repeal of the arms embargo because I believe repeal of the arms embargo is a definite step toward war and because I believe it would be so understood by our own people and by the Governments and peoples of Britain, France, Germany, and the other nations of the world.

I do not propose to, and most emphatically I will not, take a step toward war. I want to keep the United States out of this war, not push the United States into this war.

Mr. President, I desire at this time to recall to the Senate that in 1937, a little more than 2 years ago, while able to give this matter more calm consideration before the war hysteria was upon us, the Senate passed the existing Neutrality Act by a vote of 63 to 6. It passed the House 376 to 13. The President signed the act, just as he had signed practically the same act in 1935 as a temporary measure.

I also recall to mind that as recently as 1936, while the United States was comparatively calm and sane on this matter of European wars, the President bragged about this act. Especially he bragged about the step his administration had taken to preserve the peace of the United States, and I think he had reason to be proud of it.

In signing the first reenactment of the original Neutrality Act, February 29, 1936, President Roosevelt stated:

By the resolution approved August 31, 1935, a definite step was taken toward enabling this country to maintain its neutrality and avoid being drawn into wars involving other nations. It provided that in the event of the Executive proclaiming the existence of such a war, thereupon an embargo would attach to the exportation of arms, ammunition, and implements of war destined to any belligerent country. By the resolution I have just signed the operation of the August resolution is extended and strengthened until May 1, 1937.

I desire now to quote a statement made by the President in a speech at Chautauqua, N. Y., in the same year, 1936—and I regret to say that he has proved himself a true prophet in this instance by himself advocating the course of action against which he so wisely warned us during the campaign year of 1936. In discussing the existing Neutrality Act, including the arms embargo, the President said—and I believe that I am quoting him correctly:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality.

It is one of those strange things, Mr. President, that today we find a concerted movement afoot, backed by the administration itself, to break down and evade our neutrality; for, as I stated in the beginning, the plain purpose of this attempt



to repeal the arms embargo is to enable us, at a profit, to help Britain and France by selling them munitions of war.

But let us review another statement President Roosevelt made in 1936. I continue the quotation:

They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other thing to belligerent nations the unemployed of America would all find work.

That is what President Roosevelt said in 1936. Contrast with that his statement to the Congress of the United States on September 21, 1939—and again I believe I am quoting him correctly:

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we could give employment to thousands by doing it here?

That is what President Roosevelt told Congress in joint session last September 21.

We all would welcome, of course, an era of prosperity. But, for my part, I do not want prosperity that is brought to the manufacturers of implements of war used to kill many thousands of our finest young men.

In other words, President Roosevelt warned us in 1936 what those who wanted to break down or evade neutrality would do in case of war on another continent, and in 1939 proves to us that his warning was correct by himself advocating the same thing that he said in 1936 would be done by those who sought to break down or evade our neutrality.

But President Roosevelt warned us against the succeeding step also in 1936; and I continue now quoting from the President's Chautauqua speech:

They would tell you that if they could extend credit to warring nations that credit would be used in the United States to build homes and factories and pay our debts.

I am wondering just when the President of the United States will send a message to Congress urging that the prohibition of credit extensions will have to be repealed. That probably will be the next step after cash and carry.

Before proceeding, Mr. President, I wish to quote a few more words of what President Roosevelt said in his Chautauqua speech in 1936, in which he urges:

It would be hard to resist that clamor; it would be hard for many Americans, I fear, to look beyond, to realize the inevitable penalties, the inevitable day of reckoning, that comes from a false prosperity. To resist the clamor of that greed, if war should come, would require the unswerving support of all Americans who love peace.

Mr. President, that day is upon us. And the clamor is at hand. My regret is that the President of the United States, who issued a clarion call to all Americans in 1936 to resist the war clamor, now is leading the clamor in 1939, instead of resisting it with the clarity of vision and steadfastness of purpose which he so nobly advocated in 1936.

Perhaps the best explanation of the change of attitude on the part of President Roosevelt is the simple and direct one.

In 1935, in 1936, President Roosevelt was in favor of United States neutrality; he thought he was opposed to the United States taking part in Europe's wars. He wanted peace; he regarded neutrality as an essential part of a peace program.

But in 1937 the President's ideas on the part the United States should play in world affairs began to enlarge. He saw things going on in Europe that he did not like—and in that respect I will say that I myself and most other Americans had no more liking for these things than did President Roosevelt.

But President Roosevelt, who in 1936 saw in neutrality the safe path for peace, and who saw in the arms embargo an effective expression of neutrality at least—President Roosevelt in 1937 felt an urge to meddle in European affairs. He apparently felt something ought to be done about it. He made the famous quarantine-the-aggressors speech at Chicago, thereby serving Executive notice upon Europe that the United States might take part in whatever conflict over there was caused by aggression.

The Neutrality Act, including the arms embargo, had served notice that the United States expected to remain

neutral, and was willing to forego a profitable trade in munitions to do so.

From that time on the United States was bound to pursue conflicting foreign policies.

There was the statutory policy enacted by the Congress, approved by the President, applauded by the President, that neutrality would be the objective of the United States in Old World disputes; that as one means of maintaining neutrality the United States would not allow the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to warring nations in the Old World.

Then there also was the new Presidential policy that the United States had a rendezvous with destiny in Europe, the object of the rendezvous being to join forces with the good nations and against the bad—the aggressor nations.

As plainly it is difficult to maintain neutrality and at the same time take sides, of course it became necessary for the President to work for the repeal of the arms embargo, so that the Presidential urge to help Britain and France could be satisfied without violating the law of the land.

I see no reason for blinking the fact. The purpose of repealing the arms embargo is to enable the United States to help Britain and France—at the start, of course, by methods short of war.

But I must say, Mr. President, that I do not see how we are to help a little when the war is in its beginning and then to refuse to help more when more help is necessary, especially if, in the meantime, we build up a huge munitions industry in the United States, an industry that must depend upon continuing sales of munitions to keep it going.

I do not believe we can enter the war a little way and then withdraw when the war becomes hotter. We cannot, logically or psychologically, be half in and half out of this war, which I repeat, is not our war.

I think more of the United States than I do of any European country. Whatever we do, let us be sure that we are thinking of the future welfare of this country first.

I believe we should endeavor to be realistic in facing this matter.

The war issue in Europe is not humanitarianism, not democracy, not the civilization of the Western Hemisphere.

The war issue in Europe is boundary lines, spoils, or the retention of spoils won in the first World War—and power politics.

Let us not be misled, nor mislead ourselves into believing, that the Allies in Europe are fighting in some unexplained way for democracy, for civilization, for the United States.

You know, Mr. President, and I know this war is rooted in European power politics. It is not a war for democracy—the democracy for which we made the world so safe nearly a quarter of a century ago, when we also fought the war to end war.

We must do our best not to be misled by, and also do our best to counteract all this propaganda designed to lead us into this war which is not our war.

We would not even know who we might be fighting, for or against, if we allowed ourselves to be lured into the present war.

Russia—for the time being at least—is lined up with Germany, although at the same time helping to strangle Germany.

But suppose we entered this war to preserve the British Empire! suppose that Russia decided, after making her western front safe, to carry the war into China; would a Russianized China be a threat to the British Empire? Senators know it would. Moreover, who would be opposing Russia in China? My guess is that it would be Japan.

More than that, Britain would in all probability call upon her ally, the United States, to do its bit in the Orient, while Britain and France carried on the war on the western front. So there we would be, lined up with Japan against Russia in the Orient—and if we won, so would Japan. The difference of course would be that when the war was over we would withdraw from China—but Japan would not.

There are too many cross currents, too much double crossing in Old World politics for us to weather successfully. Before we undertake to run the affairs of the Old World, we might well attempt a better job of managing our own affairs: Ten million unemployed; the expenditure of \$2 for every dollar of Government income; a national debt close to \$45,000,000,000; an agriculture close to bankruptcy—these do not signify we are ready to take over world management.

Mr. President, the advocates of arms-embargo repeal state that they want the cash and carry substituted in the interest of peace. I believe they are perfectly sincere in their position. I certainly would not accuse any American of deliberately seeking the enactment of legislation for the purpose of leading the United States into active participation in the present European war.

The opponents of the arms embargo also assert that they want the arms-embargo provision repealed in the interest of neutrality. But I note that often they couple this desire for neutrality with an even greater desire to help Britain and France—but by methods short of war, of course. In this latter contention I, of course, am in no position to challenge their sincerity, but I must admit that I, myself, am a little incredulous as to the quality of neutrality that includes helping one side in the European conflict, even by methods short of war.

There has not been much said in Congress at this extraordinary session about the necessity of helping, saving, making the world safe for democracy; but there has been a barrage of this line of reasoning, or at least of argument, by other advocates of embargo repeal in the press and on the air. There are many honest people who believe we have a duty to democracies throughout the world; and not a few of these honest people are vigorous supporters of the Monroe Doctrine and would bitterly oppose European intervention in this hemisphere.

I very much fear, Mr. President, that after the arms embargo shall have been repealed—if it shall be repealed—we will hear more of this talk of democracies and civilization. That will come again after the flow of munitions has started; after we have been compelled to extend credits to our European customers; after we have made them loans so they can win their war—their war, not our war—and they have become fearful, and our leaders have become fearful, that if we do not send men as well as materials and money, they will lose their war, and with it will go all the advances we have made.

Most of us can remember a quarter of a century ago when the propaganda was spread broadcast that the same Allies, plus Russia at that time, were fighting to make the world safe for democracy; fighting a war to end war; fighting a war to save the United States that the United States should have been fighting from the start.

We believed that in 1917. Our leaders believed it. Our people believed it. Our young men believed it. No nation ever went to war more unselfishly, more enthusiastically, with higher ideals, than did the people of the United States.

And now we are listening to the overture, these ringing speeches in support of repeal of the arms embargo, for another play of the same sort, say in 1940.

The disillusionment that started in 1919 was a bitter one. The millions of boys and young men, and the billions and tens of billions of dollars that went to Europe to fight for democracy in 1917 and 1918, won the war for those who talked of democracy; but they did not save democracy. In fact, the World War just about ended democracy except in the Western Hemisphere; and today we are being asked to take a step which in my judgment will give us a war dictatorship, at least in the United States.

I am opposed to the United States sending our boys overseas again to complete the job of replacing democratic government with dictatorship all over the world, for, as I see it, that will be the result, win or lose.

Let us save our boys for something better than fodder for Europe's battlefields during this latest of the long succession of wars that Europe has fought over boundaries and power.

I do not doubt that repeal of the arms embargo will be taken in Europe—in London and Paris, Berlin and Moscow—as indicating that the United States is preparing to enter another European war to save Britain and France. Many persons in the United States will feel the same way about it. The war psychology will be materially strengthened by the action we are asked here to take.

That is enough reason to continue the arms embargo, at least throughout the present European war.

I hold that our chances of standing clear in the present European conflict are better if we remain neutral than if we take sides. It will be a terrible mistake, and a most costly one, if we blunder ourselves into an unneutral position. I say this frankly, as one whose sympathies are with Britain and France. If we are determined to go to war, to participate in this war which is not our war, I would naturally prefer that we side with France and England. But I raise the question, Why go to war at all? What would we be fighting for?

What are England and France fighting for today in Europe? According to reports, their leaders are having considerable trouble in stating clearly and concisely just what they are fighting for. If they cannot say, how can we be certain?

Or is it enough for Americans to feel they are fighting for England and France, and that we are to make good the old saw that England expects every American to do his duty?

I am not in favor of repealing the arms embargo because I believe that to repeal the arms embargo is definitely to abandon neutrality. It means that we are going to repeal the arms embargo for the purpose of selling arms and munitions to Great Britain and France. Nobody disguises the fact that that is the object of repeal. Whatever else it is, repeal is not neutrality.

I repeat, Mr. President, that repeal of the arms embargo at this time—even if one believed it to be an unsound policy of itself—cannot be and will not be interpreted anywhere except as an unneutral act. I happen to believe in the embargo.

During times of peace we enacted the arms embargo to make it easier for the United States to keep out of European wars. We are now asked to repeal it so that we may right what we are told is an injustice to one party in the present conflict.

The arms embargo was adopted as a foreign policy for America. We are asked to repeal it for the sake of the Allies in Europe.

I say that our foreign policy should be an American foreign policy, not a British foreign policy, a French foreign policy, a German foreign policy, or a Russian foreign policy. All these nations base their foreign policies on their own interests. Why should the United States base its foreign policy on their interests rather than on our own interests?

As to the question of neutrality, we could have established a cash-and-carry plan instead of the arms embargo at the time we wrote the arms embargo into law, and no question of unneutrality could have been raised.

But now the picture has changed. Europe is engaged in another major war. One side in that war—and I admit it is the side with which the great majority of Americans, including myself, are in sympathy—probably will benefit by our lifting the embargo on the sale of arms, munitions, and implements of war.

The direct benefits may be comparatively small, as proponents of repeal point out. We probably will not supply any great amount of munitions, measured against the total requirements of the Allies.

However, the indirect benefits to the Allies may be very large, indeed. In the first place, repeal of the embargo will be understood abroad, and to some extent at home—the understanding at home will become clearer as the months go by—to indicate that the United States is siding with Britain and France, and that the act is being repealed to help Britain and France. In the second place, in my opinion, the sales of munitions will start moving the same chain of events—sales, credits, loans, and finally the



sending of men to Europe to help win the war for those whom we now propose to help by methods short of war.

Repeal of the arms embargo certainly will be an unneutral act. We may just as well be realistic in this matter. Repeal also will open the way for the same series of events, or at any rate a chain of events very similar to those of the previous World War.

Let us go back 25 years and review the history of the financial events that preceded our entry into the World War.

A few weeks after the war started in Europe it was announced by the State Department that loans to any belligerent nation would be inconsistent with true neutrality. This statement was issued in August 1914. By October of the same year there had come a change in policy, slight but determinative. The State Department had been brought to the point of seeing a light. The policy was modified to allow extensions of bank credit, though not loans of money, to be made to belligerents to purchase needed supplies in the United States. We were going to be neutral but help the Allies just a little. We would not lend them money to buy needed war supplies in this country, but we would extend them credits which they could use instead of money.

Less than a year later the Secretary of State and the Secretary of the Treasury convinced President Wilson that it had become necessary to allow the Allies to raise money in this country through loans to enable them to protect the credit advances made by our bankers. This was in September 1915.

A month later the first Anglo-French loan of one-half billion dollars was floated; the credit advances of our bankers were protected; and, more important to the Allies, the door was opened for further loans to be made.

From that time on, Mr. President, the United States was committed to giving assistance to the Allies to the limit. We definitely—though not at the time knowingly so far as the great majority of American citizens were concerned—became involved in the World War. As a wise Frenchman, Andre Tardieu, former Premier of France, commented:

From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Of course, in the pending measure there is a prohibition against loans to belligerents. Undoubtedly it is there in good faith. There is a provision that title must be transferred before any materials may be exported to any belligerent. We are told that this is "cash and carry," although there is a little loophole through allowance of 90-day credits, reminiscent of the 1914 prohibition of money loans but allowing extension of bank credits instead.

Suppose, Mr. President, we should start selling munitions on a cash-and-carry basis and build up a sizeable munitions industry. We should have two customers, Britain and France. In a comparatively short time their cash available for purchases in the United States would run out. The question then would be squarely before us. We would have an industry that would be a going concern. It would afford employment and pay dividends. Its profits, wages, and requirements in the way of materials and transportation would have geared other industries into the continued successful operation of the munitions industry.

Suppose our two customers should point out to us that their cash was exhausted. Would we extend credit, or would we close down our munitions industry, with disastrous effects on our entire domestic economy?

Also, we would know that we started the sales to help the Allies. They would then be in worse straits, in more dire need, than when we repealed the arms embargo to afford them what assistance we could without involving ourselves.

The question would then be, Shall we now refuse them any more help when that refusal will mean throwing out of employment thousands or hundreds of thousands of men, and the disruption of our domestic economy, resulting in a minor, if not a major, domestic depression?

Mr. President, there will be only one answer to that question when the question is put. We will amend the cash-and-carry provisions to allow purchases on credit, probably long-term credit.

The next step will be as inevitable as it was in 1915. The credit advances will be such a heavy load for our banking structure to carry that we shall have to allow the Allies to float loans in this country to protect our banking structure.

Then the thing will happen that happened before. The prohibition against loans to belligerents—including the prohibition against loans to nations in default to the United States on previous loans—will be modified or repealed so that we may make loans to Britain and France. Then we shall be just where Andre Tardieu said we were in 1915. I repeat what he said:

From that time on, whether desired or not, the victory of the Allies became essential to the United States.

Further, Mr. President, when the victory of the Allies becomes essential to the United States we must, if necessary, go to war to insure that Allied victory. It seems to me that that conclusion is inescapable. Before that point is reached the United States will be in the grip of a war psychology that will make it traitorous, if not treasonable, for anyone to oppose our going to war.

Mr. President, I have asked that those who favor repeal of the arms embargo be realistic. In all fairness I myself must try to be realistic.

Those who favor repeal argue—and their arguments are effective in many quarters—that the present arms embargo works against Britain and France and to the advantage of Hitler. They argue that Hitler is in no position to buy munitions from us, and that without the arms embargo Britain and France could buy munitions from us. Therefore they say that in order to remove an unfairness toward our own friends we should repeal the embargo to help France and Britain.

Mr. President, if we are enacting neutrality legislation for the purpose of affecting the status of the warring European nations, that is a perfectly good and logical argument. However, it is my contention that we enacted the neutrality legislation for the purpose of protecting the United States from involvement in European wars. We enacted it while Britain, France, and Germany were not at war with one another. It was neutrality legislation then. To keep it now is certainly in the interest of American neutrality.

I think this draws plainly one of the major issues in this controversy over the arms embargo.

It is my contention, and always has been, that our foreign policy should be an American foreign policy—not a British foreign policy, a French foreign policy, or a German foreign policy.

As a part of an American foreign policy, we enacted a Neutrality Act which includes an embargo against the export of arms, ammunition, and implements of war to any belligerent nations in the Old World.

That was written into law for American purposes, to protect Americans against one path leading to involvement in European wars.

As it was written, and when it was written, it was an act of neutrality. It was neutral; not unneutral.

To rewrite that provision now for the purpose of helping Britain and France, to my mind, would be an unneutral act. It would not be neutrality.

More than that, to revise the Neutrality Act for the purpose of helping one side in a European conflict means that we are basing our foreign policy upon European interests; not upon American interests.

I repeat: The foreign policy should be an American foreign policy. Whenever we base our foreign policy upon the interest of European nations, we have abandoned a sound position for what I consider an unsound position.

Of course, Mr. President, if we are to abandon our position of neutrality, if we are to base our foreign policies upon European interests instead of the interests of the United

States, then I will admit I would favor taking the side of England as against the side of Hitler. There can be no question on that score.

But what I am trying to maintain is an American foreign policy as against a European foreign policy. When we abandoned that sound position nearly a quarter of a century ago, we did not help matters much, and certainly did not help our own people and our own Nation.

For these reasons, Mr. President, I am opposing, with all the earnestness I possess, repeal of the arms embargo as tending toward embroiling ourselves in the present European war.

I am also against any program of loans or extensions of credit by the United States Government or its citizens to any nation engaged in war.

I am opposed to modification or repeal of the Johnson Act, and I greatly fear that the measure before us proposes to abrogate the wise provisions of that act.

I am very much opposed to the 90-day credit feature of the so-called cash-and-carry provisions of the pending legislation.

Believing that repeal of the arms embargo means but one thing, namely, that we will enter the European war now raging; knowing that the people of the United States feel as I do, that we ought not and must not get into this war, which is not our war, if we possibly can avoid it, I shall continue with all my might to oppose repeal of the arms embargo. When we lift the arms embargo and start selling war supplies, it is almost equivalent to a declaration of war.

I am for a strong navy, a large air force, and adequate national defense that will repel any invader, but not for fighting Europe's battles for any European nation or set of nations.

Holland, Sweden, Switzerland, Denmark, Norway, and a half-dozen other countries next door to the trouble in Europe are showing their good sense by keeping out of the war and remaining neutral. Why should we travel 3,000 miles across the seas looking for a fight? I say let them alone.

Mr. President, our Neutrality Act was enacted in the belief that Europe's wars are not our wars. That belief is just as well grounded today as it was 2 years ago, when the Congress enacted the present law and the President signed it. So I favor keeping the Embargo Act as it is. Good sense, morals, material well-being, and devotion to the principles of democracy all sound the warning—"America, stay out."

We have between us and the trouble abroad a great ocean—a natural barrier potentially more powerful than a dozen navies. Our immediate duty to ourselves and our sister republics is to keep on this side of the world and set an example for the other side to follow. We cannot keep the peace by involving ourselves in somebody else's war.

I am sorry I cannot go along with President Roosevelt in his high enthusiasm for the welfare of the entire world, but I believe the Members of the Senate are free men, with the right to their own beliefs and the duty of living up to those beliefs. Furthermore, I am opposed to giving the President more discretionary war powers. I think Congress should remain in session as long as the emergency exists, and should perform its duties as the Constitution requires. I am glad to stay here and do my best to keep America out of war.

I intend to continue to stand for what I believe is best for my country, and that includes keeping the arms embargo in effect indefinitely.

I have my personal sympathies for England and France, but I think vastly more of the United States than I do of any European country. Whatever we do, let us be sure that we are thinking of the future welfare of this country first.

If Europeans are determined to have wars, let them fight their own wars. Our problems are right here at home, not in Europe.

Mr. President, I hope we have learned something from history. Our experience in the World War should teach us that it is a good thing to keep out of European wars. Let us not repeat the tragedy of 1917. We then lost the lives of 126,000 of our finest American boys; it cost us \$41,000,000,000. We got nothing for it—not even thanks. We loaned European

nations \$14,000,000,000, and they still owe us, and will never pay.

While on this subject, what about the rewards we got for entering the World War "to save democracy" and fight "the war to end wars"?

We did not "make the world safe for democracy."

We did not end wars.

We got no colonies; we wanted none. In this respect we differed from the Allies, who took all they could get.

We got "promises to pay" from the Allies whom we financed, as we will finance them again if we follow the course we are being asked to pursue.

How much do Great Britain and France owe the United States today in unpaid debts hanging over from the first World War? Well, the total is considerably over \$9,000,000,000, \$5,497,000,000 from Great Britain and \$4,180,000,000 from France.

Neither nation has made any serious effort to pay. Perhaps neither could pay. But we may as well face facts squarely and realize that if we should enter the present war we would be called upon to lend another \$10,000,000,000, and perhaps more, and saddle that debt upon the American survivors of this latest European conflict.

We also made approximately 23,000 new millionaires in the United States through World War profiteering. The big fellows who make huge profits in wars are anxious to get in the game again. I am opposed, as the masses of the people in this country are opposed, to giving these merchants of death a chance to pile up their millions, as they did before. If this country should supply munitions and armaments to either side it would be the worst profiteer of all—profiting by the death and suffering of millions of human beings. We must not do it. Blood money will bring neither happiness nor prosperity to the people of America.

What good the United States, and in the long run the world, would derive from the intervention of the United States in this war is more or less doubtful.

But here are some things I know the United States would get:

First, a dictatorship.

Second, a further increase in its national debt of tens of billions of dollars.

Third, loss of life running, perhaps, into millions; destruction of property running into the billions of dollars.

Fourth, after the war, a depression worse than the last one; very likely a continuation of the dictatorship; and then some more European wars.

I say we ought to keep these things in mind and stay out.

I say again the way to stay out of the European war is not to take the first step that would lead us into it—repeal of the Embargo Act.

When we start selling munitions we start entering this war, which is not our war, but just one of Europe's many wars; and if we enter one more of Europe's wars we probably shall participate in every major European war from now on.

All that that means, finally, is big profits for the munitions makers, while our own boys are being slaughtered on the battlefields in somebody else's war. I say our young men have the right to their own lives, as against the greed of the profiteers and the love of power by the European war lords.

That is the way I feel about the matter; and, judging from the thousands of letters and telegrams that have been coming to Senators and Representatives, that is the way the great majority of Americans feel about it.

I have received more than 15,000 letters and telegrams since Britain and France declared war. There are at least ten urging that the United States remain neutral for every one that would repeal the arms embargo. The Members of Congress from States clear across the country to California tell me that their mail is preponderantly the same way.

It is very plain to me that the people of this country do not want to go to war for Europe's boundaries. I think that feeling is almost unanimous.

The great majority of our people believe, and I believe, that the sale of munitions will lead us directly into the war.



I believe the great majority of the people of this country—the ones who will have to do the fighting if war comes—want the arms embargo kept in effect. They do not want the Neutrality Act amended to make it less neutral.

I say to you that these people are right. I believe the American people will keep their heads and resist all the propaganda designed to lead us into war.

Again I say, it is not our war. We must not allow ourselves to be stampeded into it. We learned our lesson 20 years ago. We cannot bring peace to Europe by taking more war to Europe; and if we start selling munitions to the warring nations of Europe, then most assuredly we are on the way to sending our boys to Europe again.

Mr. President, it is up to you, it is up to the people of the United States, to insist that Congress reject the pleas to allow the sale of munitions to warring Europe, no matter how eloquent these pleas are, no matter how well intentioned the people who would follow the course that led us to war in 1917, and will lead us there again unless Congress stands firm in this grave emergency.

I cannot help feeling that Europe is the land of the double-cross, as well as of the little white crosses. Why should America go abroad looking for either?

I find myself sympathetic with Governor Bib Graves, of Alabama, who said, "This is not our funeral, and I hope we are not going to furnish any corpses."

When the whole country is aflame, we should not be hasty in taking action. We do not need to and certainly ought not to repeat the mistake we made in entering the previous World War.

In conclusion, let me assure you that I shall protest in the Senate, with all the energy and earnestness I possess, against weakening the Neutrality Act by amendments making it less neutral. I shall insist on retaining the Embargo Act, which will stop profiteering in war supplies.

Before I close, let me say also that I am strong for the insertion of a provision for a war referendum in the Constitution of the United States. I say the men who will do the fighting, and the people who will pay the bills, should have something to say on the question of going into foreign wars.

I promise you right now that as a United States Senator I never will vote ever again to send American boys across the seas to fight in someone else's war, to wallow in the mud and blood of Europe. I say the lives of the American boys are worth more than all the land in Europe they may be fighting over.

I feel more intensely about these things than I have ever felt about any other issue before the Senate.

I pray to God that we shall not repeat the tragic experience of the first World War, and see another generation of our boys killed needlessly and wickedly in another of these wars caused by the political and racial jealousies that have been the curse of Europe for 2,000 years of history.

Mr. President, we should stay out of this war. It is not our war.

We should stay out of this war deliberately, determinedly, and finally.

We should stay out, and we should stay all the way out—not just halfway out.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, in the few remarks I shall make this afternoon it will be necessary to refer to two of our colleagues in the Senate.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TAFT in the chair). Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am glad to yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield for the purpose of enabling me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I think no one besides myself is very much interested in what I am about to say.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I heard the Senator say he was going to refer to the remarks of some of his colleagues, and I thought perhaps he would like to give them an opportunity to be present.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I am pretty sure the colleagues in question know what I am about to say, because I have talked

to one of them. I have not talked to the other; but nothing I shall say will hurt them in any way or hurt the speaker in any way. I am going to carry on in the utmost kindness, merely reciting a story to show how apparently inconsequential things may become extremely important as they affect certain persons in our daily conduct of affairs.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator yield to me for the purpose of permitting me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Wisconsin for that purpose?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. If the Senator wishes a quorum, I have no objection.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Barbour	Chavez	Holman	Sheppard
Barkley	Davis	La Follette	Stewart
Brown	Downey	McNary	Taft
Burke	Ellender	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrnes	Frazier	O'Mahoney	Townsend
Capper	Gillette	Reed	Wiley
Chandler	Green	Schwellenbach	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Twenty-seven Senators having answered to their names, there is not a quorum present. The clerk will call the names of the absent Senators.

The legislative clerk called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. AUSTIN, Mr. BANKHEAD, Mr. GEORGE, Mr. GUFFEY, Mr. HILL, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. LUNDEEN, Mr. McKELLAR, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NORRIS, Mr. OVERTON, Mr. PITTMAN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. SCHWARTZ, and Mr. SLATTERY answered to their names when called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Sergeant at Arms be directed to request the attendance of absent Senators.

The motion was agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Sergeant at Arms will execute the order of the Senate.

Mr. PEPPER, Mr. VANDENBERG, Mr. HAYDEN, Mr. McCARRAN, Mr. BAILEY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado, Mr. ANDREWS, Mr. BILBO, Mr. BULOW, Mr. CONNALLY, Mr. LODGE, Mr. MALONEY, and Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the order of the Senate just entered be vacated.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, when I was interrupted for the quorum call, I had made the statement that in the few remarks I shall make it will be necessary to refer to two of my colleagues, because the remarks are made for the purpose of correcting the record. There is no unkindness in my heart toward anyone. It may even be necessary to mention that some members of the press are responsible for bringing about the condition that resulted in a misquotation which has done great damage to the cause for which we are here called together and for which we are striving.

Because of this fact, Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as part of my remarks a radio address which I made on the night of September 11, 1939, and which is supposed to be the address from which these quotations were taken.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The address is as follows:

Since the first Neutrality Act of 1935 became a law its embargoing provisions have been invoked three times. Had the Italian-Ethiopian War continued for a long period and had the attempt to put sanctions upon Italy become general, the American embargo might have complemented the League's sanctions, giving the theory of embargo a test as a war stopper. In the Spanish civil war some of the strongest supporters of the Neutrality Act advocated the raising of the embargo when it seemed to be working too much to the advantage of one side. In the Italian-Ethiopian case many persons charged that the act was a green "Go" light for Mussolini. But the facts do not bear this out, as the things embargoed Italy had plenty of and Ethiopia could not have purchased from us amounts

of sufficient quantity and have got them in time to have affected greatly the outcome. In the Chinese-Japanese War the Neutrality Act has not been invoked. Our actual experiences, therefore, have kept the discussion about America's Neutrality Acts since 1935 in the realm of theory.

Now, today, America finds herself, because of the major aspects of the present war, in regard to the Neutrality Act, in the realm of fact; yet there seems to be but a hazy appreciation of what the realm of fact means. For example, while the President has invoked the Neutrality Act against all of the nations at war in Europe, the act remains uninvoked against the states in Asia. And in addition to that when once war was definitely started in Europe, the President found it necessary to declare our neutrality first under the ordinary rules of international law and war, and then to issue a second proclamation in accord with the provisions of the 1937 Neutrality Act. Thus the fact that America is operating as a neutral does not lessen the complications in regard to theory.

#### ALIGNED WITH VARIOUS NEUTRALS

America finds herself aligned now with other neutrals, neutrals with various shades of meaning and neutrals for different reasons, each interpreting its neutral duties in a different way. For example, as of today, or, I had better say, as of the day I dictated this paragraph, because changes are moving so rapidly that one must speak only for the moment. Russia, Italy, and Japan all have a neutral standing along with us, yet none of these three states has anything like our neutrality law. More significant even than that is the fact that all of them have, or have had, certain very binding agreements with Germany—agreements which now seem to lack definiteness on which to place or venture an opinion on tomorrow's stand. Then we have the neutrality of such a state as Switzerland. Switzerland's neutrality is a forced one. So essential to Switzerland's very existence is her neutral stand that even with her neutrality recognized by all she has found that the presence of the League of Nations and its radio station are probable sources of embarrassment.

The Scandinavian states, the lowland states, the Baltic republics, along with the Balkan states, have all declared their neutrality. Certain South American states have taken action. According to newspaper reports, Argentina, Brazil, and Chile seem determined to remain neutral in the European war, even if the United States should become a party to that war. This is an extremely interesting declaration in the light of what certain South American states did in the last war after we entered it, when they refused to stand on their rights and duties as a neutral as far as the United States was concerned. This action, too, is interesting from the standpoint of our own Neutrality Act, because in it we have declared that the Neutrality Act shall not apply to an American republic or republics unless such a republic or republics are cooperating with a non-American state in a war. For these and other reasons, it is difficult, indeed, to put definite exactness into the meaning of "neutrality" as that word is now used in the world and, for that matter, in the United States.

#### WORTHY OBJECTIVES IN ACT

America's Neutrality Act has behind it definite objectives and these objectives are worthy in every sense. They were expressed at their very best at the time of the discussion of the Neutrality Act of 1935 when our Democratic leader, the late Senator Joe Robinson, uttered the sentence: "We want no war, and we want no profits from war." After 4 years of neutrality legislation, I am convinced that the American people want two things, as these wants are expressed in our present Neutrality Act. First, they desire to reduce as much as possible the danger of any war profits which might involve us in a war, for few Americans want to see America involved in war and, second, the average American wants to see America's economic and moral forces kept in a position so that she may not be a contributor to war or the war maker, but so that she may be able to use her moral and economic forces for peace in the world when the time for making peace comes. There are, of course, tremendous differences of opinion about how best to accomplish these objectives. America's task today then is to produce the type of unity which will cause her to remain uninvolved, and at the same time contribute to the promotion of peace and to the limitation of the war area. We shall soon see whether our Neutrality Act is an aid or a hindrance in the accomplishment of these desires.

The actual working out of the Neutrality Act will furnish the factors making for change or the retention of the act as it is. Upon these factors, too, will depend the nature of the President's recommendations in connection with a special call. Those of us who are members of the Foreign Relations Committee are asked two questions by a half dozen reporters every day. First, "Will there be a special session?" and, second, "Will you vote the same way next time as you did last?" After an actual working of the Neutrality Act the recommendations will of necessity be based upon actual facts and not upon theory as were the last suggested amendments. There is a vast difference between considering an act before the outbreak of war and before the act's invocation, and after a major war comes into existence, and the act has been invoked. Now Congress and the President will act in the face of facts, not of theories.

#### DEFINITE DUTIES AS NEUTRAL

If we can remain objective at all times, unimpulsive in our thinking, if we can live down slogans and the effects of words of uncertain meanings upon our actions, America can remain out of the war, regardless of how severe it may become. America can still maintain, not in the absolute but generally speaking, all of her neutral rights; but we will maintain our neutral rights longer

if we stress our neutral duties and if we sincerely live in accordance with those neutral duties that are now devolved upon us. Those duties are rather definite.

The President's two proclamations, the Neutrality Act and the President's Sunday night radio talk, have all contributed to showing us what are our duties. Nothing will be gained by anyone either within the United States or without if America finds herself involved in war. The good that can possibly come to the world as a result of restored peace will of necessity be the good that will come as a result of a good peace. The more neutrals there are in the world when the time for making peace comes, the better will be the thinking of the world, and the force of the objective thinking will be able to temper the impulses of both the victor and the vanquished.

At the end of the World War, due to the fact that all of the great nations had entered the war, the peacemakers and their peoples were caught between two emotions—one to punish and the other to build a new world order. So strong were these conflicts that it was deemed necessary to join in one document both the punishing elements and the constructive plans. This made universal support for the whole document impossible and caused those who really opposed but a part to oppose the whole. Next time may the neutral force in the world be so strong and so aloof that the victor-vanquished settlements may be confined to those limited problems, and the constructive planning for world peace be left to nations at peace, planning for a peace which will be upbuilding for all, not a peace made by victors.

#### IMPARTIALITY AIDS STRONGER

Now, everyone is interested in the test of our Neutrality Act. If it has defects and therefore needs amendment, those defects will be shown very quickly. The act implies a neutrality based upon the theory of impartiality. I have always held that, while American law always assumed this and text writers have maintained that neutrality meant impartiality, this could not be, first because impartiality could never be obtainable. Neutrality can be proclaimed and lived up to, but try as we will impartiality, even though proclaimed, can never be lived up to. If two nations are contending and a neutral does nothing, the effect of inaction is to aid the stronger of those two nations. If the neutral acts in an impartial way and treats each in exactly the same way, the effect still is to aid the stronger. If the neutral takes sides, he, of course, is not impartial.

Let us make our illustration even simpler: Two men are fighting to the death on a desert. One gains all the water, the other has none. You, a neutral, come along with plenty of water. You say this fight does not concern you because you are a neutral and you stand on your neutral rights and do nothing. From the standpoint of the law of neutrality you have done no wrong, but you have not been impartial. You know that the withholding of the water from the one has meant his certain death and victory for the other.

Therefore, impartial neutrality in a practical sense is utterly impossible. That which is impossible in fact is very poor substance on which to base a rule of law. To the extent that our neutral stands have been based upon impartiality they have been weak. When we have taken the position that neutrality means remaining aloof from war upon the theory that a nation that does not fight has rights in the world that belligerents or war cannot destroy, we have been strong in our neutrality and no one has made war on us because of that stand. Nations at war are busy with actual enemies. They do not deliberately attempt to turn neutrals into enemies.

#### MORALITY AT STAKE

Let's keep our thinking straight. Just because one nation attacks another and war begins, the warring states do not thereby gain all the rights to the whole earth. Neutrals still have rights and they still have duties. One of these rights is to protest wrongdoing and advantage taking wherever it exists. You cannot be impartial if one combatant only commits the wrong. A referee in the prize ring must be neutral, and his neutrality makes him impartial as long as both fighters are fair; but when one fouls, the referee must still remain neutral; he has no right to take part in the fight, but he need not be impartial and declare the fight a draw just because one man fouls. Without changing one bit his neutral position, he penalizes the wrongdoer. His neutrality is preserved but his impartiality has gone. The rights of both fighters and the referee are all preserved. A neutrality that demands an impartiality calls for a dulling of every moral impulse. It insists upon erasing the line between good and evil. That is asking too much. That reduces a neutral to an unbearable impotence. A neutral has a right to stand for something in the world, not for nothing. If neutrality means a crushing of world morality, it is better that we take sides and fight, because fighting for a right is better than passive submission to a wrong.

Neutrality is a matter of degree. Take, for example, the different theories expressed today about Italy's neutrality—is Italy's neutrality today to the advantage of Germany, Italy's ally, or it is to the advantage of Germany's enemies? Thus, if we answer the question we discover that neutrality must rest upon some other reason than that of a desire to be impartial. That reason may be an entirely selfish one on the part of a neutral just to avoid war. It may be, as many have expressed the American neutrality to be, an action on the part of a great neutral, which will discourage war in the world. Our most consistent stand is one based on morality, a morality which recognizes that we have rights which even belligerents must respect, a morality which recognizes that even belligerents have rights, which makes it our duty to respect those rights; a morality, too, which entitles us to condemn wherever we



see wrongdoing if need be by any action short of war. That, I am sure, is the true American stand.

A condemnation of a wrongdoer has never brought war. When the nations of the world, through the agency of the League of Nations, attempted to impose sanctions on Italy in accordance with the theory that economic pressure could stop war, Mussolini started the cry that sanctions meant war. But sanctions did not mean war. Mussolini did not go to war against any state that imposed those sanctions, but Mussolini wiped out of existence the little state of Albania, which refused to vote sanctions. Thus, sloganized thinking and historical fact are very different propositions.

#### INCONSISTENCIES IN ACT

The test of the American Neutrality Act will come out of uncertainties in administration of the act, not from emotional reactions about theory. If we should ultimately find ourselves in war, that action will come as a result of emotional reaction, because of a sense of outraged justice. That is an emotional deduction. That will be action of impulse without deliberating over all the factors and weighing all the costs. I do not think that America will ever modify the Neutrality Act because she will deliberately want to take sides. If we get into that frame of mind, we will go to war without modification of the Neutrality Act. But the circumstances about the administration of the Neutrality Act will furnish the stimulus for the act's modification. For example, when we see the inconsistency of not allowing the sale of a shell to a belligerent but allowing the shipment of all that goes into that shell, when we see that we cannot sell guncotton to a belligerent but that we can sell all the raw cotton which can be converted into guncotton, we will readily see these inconsistencies in the act.

When the inconsistencies are discovered the stage is properly set for a modification of the act, but immediately comes another factor which may be a controlling one and which shows how a nation of impartiality must fail. Can you change the rules of the game after the game has started? If it is to the advantage of one belligerent to change the rules, and to the disadvantage of another belligerent to change the rules, will the modification be an impartial act?

Another test of our Neutrality Act which may bring the necessity for a modification will be a changed world situation. When the Neutrality Acts were passed, America attempted to write her part for the war drama assuming that her part could fit into any stage setting that might be brought about. It is the mandatory provision in the act that does this. Can our part be the same in a great war where the belligerents are many score and the neutrals are few, as it is in a war where the belligerents are two or three and the neutrals are many score? Can our neutrality be the same when there are two distinct wars being carried on, one in Asia and one in Europe, as it is when there is one World War? When the line-up of belligerents and neutrals is constantly changing, as it probably will, can our Neutrality Act remain static while everything it affects or is affected by it is in a state of flux? These are the types of questions which should make us thoughtful about the conditions facing us under the present circumstances.

#### HISTORY CAN TEACH AVOIDANCE

Due to the fact that there has been since 1935 much discussion about the Neutrality Acts and our remaining out of war as a result of them, persons have become confused. With a major war in Europe we would have been operating as we are today as a result of a neutrality proclamation even if there were no 1937 Neutrality Act on the statute books. We have the status of a neutral as the result of the existence of the law of nations, and the President's proclamations are in accordance with long-standing precedents and such acts as those of 1909, 1917, and 1937. If the people of the United States wish to remain neutral, they can do so as long as they wish. America remained neutral from August 1914 to April 1917, nearly 3 years, during the World War. If our ultimate entrance into the World War was a mistake, as many today insist, we should study our history from 1914 to 1917 and avoid the mistakes that led us into the war.

History viewed objectively will contribute greatly to an appreciation of the problems which will face our Nation now as a neutral. It is our nature to wisecrack. Our language and our life invite it. We say "the Constitution is what the judges say it is" and "that history is what the historians say it is." Both statements are pretty. They can be acceptably used to cover vast ignorance, even though they were originally uttered by the most learned. Anyone who wants to understand our Government's neutral problems today should study the history of 1914-17. Objective study will show that we can remain neutral, maintain our neutral rights, live up to our neutral duties if we have a mind to. Study, too, will show that America is more united in opinion today than she was in 1914, but President Wilson's neutrality proclamation received the same whole-hearted support from all our citizens in August 1914 as President Roosevelt's did today. Even ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, who later so strongly took sides and urged in the strongest terms that America should enter the war on the side of England and France, wrote during the first weeks of the war, "Of course it would be folly to jump into the gulf ourselves, and to no good purpose, and very probably nothing that we could have done would have helped Belgium. We have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen her" (Outlook, September 23, 1914).

Let us review the first days of the 1914 World War and our neutrality then. We will find much that is the same; still we will see a great difference. Then we assumed a European war was, after all, not of our concern. Today we may assert that, but we know it is hardly true. The real truth in each case is and was

that war anywhere is of universal concern. Peace, too, must be of universal concern. Regardless of what anyone may think or hope, the world is a unit in more ways than in its purely physical one.

Today no one expects anyone to be neutral in mind and thought. One Nation-wide poll on who is responsible for the present war shows that 82 percent of our people hold one side responsible. That does not give great promise for impartiality.

#### WHEAT WILSON URGED

In 1914, President Wilson, 2 weeks after issuing his neutrality proclamation, said: "The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are trying men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle above another. My thought is of America—a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own councils, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world."

But proclamations and speeches do not alter facts. They are powerless when it comes to changing men's opinions. The people of our country were not impartial in thought. Still they remained neutral in fact as far as actions were concerned for nearly 3 years. They stood on their rights and they condemned the wrongdoer. And while standing as a neutral their condemnation of a wrong did not take them into war. Had it done so we would have fought on both sides.

American neutrality has not been an unchanging thing from Washington's first neutrality proclamation to the present. It has grown and developed or it has become weak and supine, according to the emphasis. Sometimes neutral rights have been stressed, at other times neutral duties. There is an ocean of distance both in theory and fact between Jefferson's notion, that it was not the function of the Government to interfere with the economic affairs of the people and that as many people made their living in manufacturing arms their sale should not be prohibited, and the 1937 Neutrality Act. From the beginning to the present the American tendency has been to interpret neutrality to mean impartiality and to withdraw all moral judgments and base our stand of neutrality upon a simple rule of law instead of upon moral actions. It is nevertheless here where our neutrality has failed and we have turned to war. Therefore let's give up the "impartial" dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged and place our neutrality upon the fundamental rights of a nation to carry on its peaceful pursuits even during war without being a party to the war. Whatever our neutrality has meant during the last 140 years, the right to stay at peace has been stronger than our dream of being impartial in thought, word, speech, and action.

Let us stand upon this platform—war between two or more nations cannot diminish the rights of any nation or nations that want to remain at peace. Maintain that stand upon a moral basis. Then American neutrality will stand and become the force in the world it should be.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. That speech was delivered on the night of September 11. On the night of September 14 the senior Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] spoke on the radio, and in his address these words were used:

The talk here in Washington is no longer that of merely furnishing arms. It is said we must prepare to fight. One of my colleagues, a most able and sincere Senator, declared a few nights ago publicly: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better," said he, "to take sides and fight."

He was speaking out boldly what is now heard from the same sources from which came the agitation of furnishing arms. And, if in a few months we can tear up the law which a nation almost universally approved, how long do you think it will take to put across the proposition of sending our young men into the trenches once we have intervened?

Mr. President, it will be noted that the senior Senator from Idaho did not use my name, did not mention my name, and I am sure that I could not claim the authorship of the words quoted in the extract. I heard the address over the radio. It did not seem to me that I could possibly be the author of those words. In fact, to anyone who has read anything about international law or international relations, the sentence about impartiality and neutrality is indeed such a stupid sentence that my feelings are almost hurt when I realize that it has been charged up to me.

The following morning, in telling the story of the radio address made by the Senator from Idaho, the editorial writer, or, rather, probably the man on the desk in the newspaper office, did a bit of editorial work and put in parentheses that the senior Senator from Idaho was referring to the junior Senator from Utah, gave my name, and let it go out to the world that I had made that statement.

Then, Mr. President, some very interesting things happened. On the 13th of September the Chicago Tribune had a full column and a quarter editorial about our going

to war, and in that editorial was a reference to the junior Senator from Utah.

My pride, of course, was exceedingly great to realize that my name was used in the editorial of a great metropolitan newspaper, because that has not occurred very often in my lifetime. In my lifetime, too, I have done some editorial writing, so I know that only certain people are on the accredited list, and I knew that I was not on the accredited list of any newspaper columnist or any newspaper editor. Therefore, it was gratifying to have broken into the press, and I am very grateful for that. But to have broken into the press, and then to have been given credit for something which I am not entitled to, of course, hurt my feelings and cut my pride.

In its editorial the Chicago Tribune carries on as follows:

Now it is proposed—it is Mr. Roosevelt's proposal—that with a recognized state of war in Europe and with the Neutrality Act in effect there shall be an amendment permitting Americans to sell munitions to nations which can purchase for cash, take title to the goods, and transport them in their own ships. That means that the British and French can put orders for any supplies they need with American factories.

Administration spokesmen—

Mr. President, note that—

Administration spokesmen leave no doubt in anyone's mind as to the purpose of this. Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, Utah Democrat of the Foreign Relations Committee, said in a radio address that a neutrality which does not distinguish between good and evil reduces the neutral country to an unbearable impotence. The righteous neutrality, he said, did not mean impartiality. "Therefore," he said, "let us give up the impartial dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged." This expresses the view of Mr. Roosevelt's administration and the American people should give it full consideration.

Mr. President, it was true that when I came to the Senate I had been a college professor, and there was much talk of the "brain trust," but I was never able to break into that sanctified group. Probably I was barred because of my age. I know it has been said that a number of us speak for the administration, but, in the whole history of the Presidency of the United States, there never was a time when the President was so well able to speak for himself as at the present time, nor has any President with greater insistence spoken for himself.

In the past we have had spokesmen for the administration, but anyone who characterizes Franklin D. Roosevelt as an ancient leader of Israel—Moses—characterized himself as one being slow of speech and therefore needing a spokesman, is using his imagination in a way that simply does not fit the facts.

There have been persons in the Roosevelt administration who have spoken for the administration. A colleague of mine from Columbia University, a former professor, in the earlier days, spoke for the President. He is now writing about him, but he no longer speaks for the President. Another colleague of mine, a great general, whom I highly respected in war days, and still do, spoke for the President for some time. Now he is writing a column. He does not any longer speak for the President.

Mr. President, in the light of these circumstances, and being somewhat familiar with history, the last thing I should want to become would be spokesman for the President. I ask, who would like to be an Aaron for Franklin D. Roosevelt? I would not.

Mr. MINTON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I yield.

Mr. MINTON. I do not think the Senator should be unduly disturbed about that Chicago Tribune editorial, because no one ever reads an editorial in the Chicago Tribune.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Now, Mr. President, I am sunk. [Laughter.] Here I have been getting great satisfaction from the fact that at last I have broken into the columns of the press only to learn that in this great country of ours no one reads the editorial.

The Chicago Daily News of the 15th of September carried the following story:

Except to call attention to the President's neutrality proclamations and his special session call, BORAH did not directly mention Roosevelt, but he replied—again without identifying his target—to the Monday night radio argument by Senator ELBERT D. THOMAS, of Utah, administration backer.

"It is now proposed," said BORAH, "to repeal entirely this provision of the law, to enable this Government to furnish arms to one side and to withhold them from the other. All anyone need do to know that this is the real, the controlling, purpose of repeal, is to read the literature on repeal down to the last 48 hours.

The talk here in Washington is no longer that of merely furnishing arms. It is said: "We must prepare to fight." One of my colleagues—meaning Mr. THOMAS of Utah—declared a few nights ago publicly, "Let us give up the dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better," said he, "to take sides and fight."

On September 17 the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] was again quoted in the Chicago Tribune. The heading refers to THOMAS' speech:

My friend, Senator ELBERT THOMAS, of Utah, one of the leading revisionists, let the cat out of the bag the other night as to the real position of the neutrality revisionists when he boldly declared: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight." Those who favor the course of taking sides and fighting should naturally vote for the repeal of the arms embargo as a vital step in that direction. Those who favor keeping out of war should vote for the retention of our present safeguards and the addition of any others which may be necessary.

Mr. President, some of the words in this quotation, or misquotation, are found in my talk. Part of them, however, are found on page 9 of my talk, and the other part, not identically, on page 5. A very interesting sentence has been made up, a sentence which is illogical and meaningless; and I was perfectly happy to have forgotten all about it, in spite of the things I shall show, until last Saturday night, when I was debating the question before the Academy of Political and Social Science in Philadelphia, on the program with Dr. Borchard, Dr. Fenwick, and Dr. Libby.

My colleague, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. CLARK], delivered a 3-hour address, and from that 3-hour address Dr. Borchard found nothing that he deemed worthy of quoting except this sentence of mine. I do not know whether or not that is a reflection upon the Senator from Missouri or his speech. I do not think so. The point is that this thing was started again over the country, and the newspapers around Yale University carried the quotation from the Senator from Missouri. The reason why they carried it was because the Senator, in his remarks on page 280 of the RECORD, had this to say:

There are, in this country, perfectly honorable and patriotic men and women who conceive that our interests are so inextricably interwoven with those of Great Britain and France and Poland that we should step forward openly and frankly as a partner and ally. They agreed with the blunt declaration made only a few weeks ago by Foreign Minister George Bonnet of France, that it is the duty of the United States to come forward boldly and announce that in the event of war we would be found fighting with all our men and all our resources on the side of Great Britain, France, and Poland. Now that the catastrophe of war has occurred, they would have the United States proceed without delay to take its place in the struggle on the side of those Allies. With regard to neutrality, they echo with enthusiasm the frank and candid words of the able and erudite Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], one of the authors of the committee substitute, when he said, in a recent radio address:

"Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight."

With such a view I am in passionate disagreement, and I believe that the American people when they completely understand the issue will be in overwhelming disagreement. But, Mr. President, while I violently and completely dissent from the judgment, I respect such opinions when openly and candidly expressed.

The throwing in of the word "impartiality," of course, brought the attention of the country to the real situation about the law of neutrality. There is no law of impartiality; but there is a law of neutrality. I imagine that if one were to go to the trouble of looking up the adjectives "neutral" and "impartial," he would find that probably both are described by the same synonym, "unbiased." However, if one searches through the international lawbooks, he will find the law of neutrality, but he will never find the law of impartiality. I know, too, as I shall later show, that it has been the American interpretation of the law that a neutral should act in such a way that he is impartial in regard to belligerents.

On the 18th of September the United States News gave over its whole editorial page to an article entitled "The Partiality Law." That, and other references, brought forth a consideration of the idea of impartiality in the press of the country.



Dr. Charles A. Beard was asked to write, and did write, a series of articles for the Scripps-Howard newspapers, merely giving information in regard to the question before us. The first sentence in the first article of Dr. Beard's paper shows the point which I have been trying to make, and shows the reason for it. We all know where Dr. Beard stands on this question. His opening statement is:

Neutrality does not mean and never can mean "impartiality" in the sense that American policy and acts must confer the same or equal benefits upon both sides in the war.

About this same time, Mr. President, an advertisement was published throughout the country in a great number of newspapers. I am sure it was this advertisement which brought forth the great avalanche of letters which came to me, especially as a result of my being made a part of the "war-mongering crowd," as we are called. This advertisement stated plainly:

The revision of the Neutrality Act means war for America.

Mr. President, we cannot blame anyone for being worked up under such circumstances, and for taking it for granted that an advertisement which is put in a newspaper is based upon facts. So, of course, no one can have any feeling except of the most respectful kind toward anyone who took the trouble to write.

Mr. President, really great and honest consideration should be given to the situation we have caused. I spoke on a Nation-wide radio hook-up. My address attracted absolutely no attention. I received probably the usual 50 or 60 "fan" and "pan" letters. I shall have to take back the "pan," because I received no "panning" at all. I received only "fan" mail as a result of my talk.

Then came the misquotation. My mail jumped into the hundreds, and every letter was a "panning" letter, written with a bitterness and hate which cannot help but influence anyone.

Mr. President, it would be wrong to bring before the Senate many of those letters; but I shall bring to the attention of the Senate three of them, to show how cruel letters can be, and how unjust it is even to misquote a man in whom the country is in no way interested.

This letter is dated September 17. It came in an envelope and was signed, but bore no return address. The envelope was postmarked in two towns in Massachusetts. The letter reads:

DEAR SENATOR: If you want to fight so badly, go join the British Army. It's a wonder to me how men of your caliber ever get into the Senate or anywhere else as far as that goes. You seem to forget that you are elected to fulfill certain obligations—primarily to keep peace. If we wanted war, we could have hired a dictator. You ought to know that war is a costly game and that the winners lose. You're a Senator, not a ditch digger; so use that head of yours. Best wishes,

A. C. WHITE.

[Laughter.]

Mr. President, that letter would cause anyone some concern; but on the next day I received a letter from one of our great universities, from a man who signs himself "Ph. D." and "M. D.," and who is the head of a large department in one of America's greatest universities. It will be noted that I have eliminated his name and the name of the college, because I am going to say some rather harsh things about this letter:

DEAR SENATOR THOMAS: According to newspaper reports the following is attributed to you: "Let us give up this dream of impartiality, therefore, of neutrality. It is better to take sides and fight." If these statements were really used by you and they represent your feelings as a United States Senator, then I wish to take strenuous exception to them. With due respect to your position, I think at this critical time, when the feelings of citizens can be so easily aroused, it is the solemn duty of our political leaders to be very temperate in their public utterances. I may further tell you that I have supported President Roosevelt in many of his proposals, but your utterances were the final argument to set me very firmly against lifting the embargo on arms. A number of my friends share my feelings. As an administration spokesman you have placed the Government in a very vulnerable position. In my opinion, the many Congressmen and millions of citizens who oppose lifting the embargo have a clear-cut case against the Government, and their argument that lifting the embargo brings us very close to if not in the war becomes a most convincing one.

I sincerely hope that other Government supporters will find more logical and humane arguments for lifting the embargo than those which are implied in your alleged public utterances, which seem to me so inflammatory and ill-advised at this time.

Certainly your statements do not harmonize with the same words used by our President in his recent radio address. It is my most earnest hope that whatever action is taken in Congress, it will be based on the premise that the United States will not enter into the present lamentable European carnage.

This letter presents my personal opinion and in no way is connected with my duties at the university.

Mr. President, the seriousness of such a letter, sent by a man who signs himself "Ph. D." and "M. D." is this: Such a writer breaks the cardinal canon of all scientific work. If a student came before this professor and expected to have bestowed upon him a doctor's degree, and attempted to bring in something as hearsay, he would be "flunked" immediately. Yet this man, who is a guide, passes judgment, by the merest kind of hearsay, and immediately condemns a colleague to a position in which he himself would hate to find himself. I repeat, the cardinal canon of scientific work is to state facts, to find facts, to get facts, and at all times never make a misquotation.

Another letter came which is not only very cruel but very filthy—the type of letter which all of us have received lately. I have copied part of this letter because it is a letter written by an extremely foolish man, and it is a letter, I know, written by a man who knows nothing about war, and who knows nothing about the responsibilities in connection with war:

If you want to fight, why don't you go over and fight yourself? You're sitting pretty. Send yourself; don't send us. We don't like to get killed any more than you do. Maybe you don't know this. It is a lot easier to order someone else to die than it is to die yourself.

Mr. President, those words cut to the quick. I have seen more war than I dare talk about or think about, not only our own wars but wars in other places.

To me there is nothing heroic about war. If war comes tomorrow, probably I shall be doing just exactly the same thing that I did during the last war—running errands, obeying orders, carrying out certain details. I repeat, there is no longer anything heroic about war. It is a grim tragedy, and everyone must share the burden.

The thing in that letter that cut was the fact that the writer had hit a man who did not have an opportunity to order divisions or regiments or companies to do certain things, but a man whose duty it was to pick individuals. Mr. President, I am guilty of having selected men and having shot them over ahead of their companions on replacement calls; and the foolish man who wrote that letter does not know anything about the fact that it is easier to send someone else over the top than it is to go yourself. The foolish man who thinks those things does not know the experience of practically every thoughtful officer in the United States Army who learned from actual experience that the happiest day of his life was not when he could give the command "You go" or "Forward," but when he realized that he was able to say, "Let's go." That became the characteristic of the American boys and the American Army on the other side; and that was easier by almost any kind of degree than the selection of a boy here whose mother and father you know, and a boy there whose mother and father you know, and sending him out of turn. It was not an easy task. I repeat, the extremely foolish man who accepts such a philosophy of life and such an idea of his Government is not contributing anything to the upbuilding of manhood in this country or to a recognition of the fact that his Government is a government of the people and supposed to represent the people.

This quotation has reached other countries. On October 7 I received a postal card sealed in an envelope, mailed in Montreal, and sent to me, addressed:

MEIN HERR: We have orders to prepare the way to the German armies that will invade the United States soon.

Gas tests were made in New York and Boston subways lately.

You do not imagine that the rotten American Army can resist our victorious armies longer than the Polish armies did.

Our Fuehrer will make you kneel down and will seize all the American wealth soon.

This is signed by a gentleman by the name of "Fritz Hitler"; but it comes as a result of that quotation.

Mr. President, out of fairness to myself, since I have taken the time I have consumed to deny—if that is the proper word—that I ever thought or could ever use the type of sentence that has been credited to me, it is necessary, I think, that I tell those who are kind enough to listen what was said in this radio talk.

Remember, the President had not called Congress into extraordinary session. When this talk was given, we did not know whether there was to be an extraordinary session. Those of us who had been asked whether the President would call an extraordinary session had always answered, or at least I had, that of course any President of the United States would like to have the Congress in session during any time of great emergency.

I was requested to give this talk over the radio, and in promising to do so I said, "I will do it only on one condition, that is, that it can be a talk, not in advocacy of anything, but a talk in explanation of the problems which face the country in regard to neutrality. There is no partisanship in this talk, there is no taking sides. It is a talk delivered primarily so that the people of the country, and especially the students who are starting into school and are going to study these things, might see the big problems in relation to neutrality."

After analyzing the various kinds of neutrality, and pointing out that physical conditions call for different types of neutrality, I proceeded:

For these and other reasons it is difficult indeed to put definite exactness into the meaning of "neutrality" as that word is now used in the world and for that matter in the United States.

America's Neutrality Act has behind it definite objectives, and these objectives are worthy in every sense. They were expressed at their very best at the time of the discussion of the Neutrality Act of 1935, when our Democratic leader, the late Senator Joe Robinson, uttered the sentence, "We want no war, and we want no profits from war." After 4 years of neutrality legislation, I am convinced that the American people want two things, as these wants are expressed in our present Neutrality Act. First, they desire to reduce as much as possible the danger of any war profits which might involve us in a war, for few Americans want to see America involved in war, and, second, the average American wants to see America's economic and moral forces kept in a position so that she may not be a contributor to war or the war maker, but so that she may be able to use her moral and economic forces for peace in the world when the time for making peace comes. There are, of course, tremendous differences of opinion about how best to accomplish these objectives. America's task today, then, is to produce the type of unity which will cause her to remain uninvolved and at the same time contribute to the promotion of peace and to the limitation of the war area. We shall soon see whether our Neutrality Act is an aid or a hindrance in the accomplishment of these desires.

If we can remain objective at all times, unimpulsive in our thinking; if we can live down slogans and the effects of words of uncertain meanings, upon our actions America can remain out of the war regardless of how severe it may become. America can still maintain, not in the absolute but generally speaking, all of her neutral rights, but we will maintain our neutral rights longer if we stress our neutral duties and if we sincerely live in accordance with those neutral duties that are now devolved upon us. Those duties are rather definite.

Imagine being charged with wanting to go to war as a result of a speech containing the following:

The President's two proclamations, the Neutrality Act, and the President's Sunday night radio talk have all contributed to showing us what are our duties. Nothing will be gained by any one either within the United States or without if America finds herself involved in war. The good that can possibly come to the world as a result of restored peace will of necessity be the good that will come as a result of a good peace. The more neutrals there are in the world when the time for making peace comes, the better will be the thinking of the world, and the force of the objective thinking will be able to temper the impulses of both the victor and the vanquished.

At the end of the World War, due to the fact that all of the great nations had entered the war, the peacemakers and their peoples were caught between two emotions—one to punish and the other to build a new world order. So strong were these conflicts that it was deemed necessary to join in one document both the punishing elements and the constructive plans. This made universal support for the whole document impossible and caused those who really opposed but a part to oppose the whole. Next time may the neutral force in the world be so strong and so aloof that the victor-vanquished settlements may be confined to those limited

problems and the constructive planning for world peace be left to nations at peace planning for a peace which will be upbuilding for all—not a peace made by victors.

Then I get into the discussion of impartiality:

#### IMPARTIALITY AIDS STRONGER

Now, everyone is interested in the test of our Neutrality Act. If it has defects and therefore needs amendment, those defects will be shown very quickly. The act implies a neutrality based upon the theory of impartiality. I have always held that, while American law always assumed this and text writers have maintained that neutrality meant impartiality, this could not be. First, because impartiality could never be obtainable. Neutrality can be proclaimed and lived up to, but try as we will impartiality, even though proclaimed, can never be lived up to. If two nations are contending and a neutral does nothing, the effect of inaction is to aid the stronger of those two nations. If the neutral acts in an impartial way and treats each in exactly the same way the effect still is to aid the stronger. If the neutral takes sides he, of course, is not impartial.

Let us make our illustration even simpler: Two men are fighting to the death on a desert. One gains all the water, the other has none. You, a neutral, come along with plenty of water. You say this fight does not concern you because you are a neutral and you stand on your neutral rights and do nothing. From the standpoint of the law of neutrality you have done no wrong, but you have not been impartial. You know that the withholding of the water from the one has meant his certain death and victory for the other.

Therefore, impartial neutrality in a practical sense is utterly impossible. That which is impossible in fact is very poor substance on which to base a rule of law. To the extent that our neutral stands have been based upon impartiality they have been weak. When we have taken the position that neutrality means remaining aloof from war upon the theory that a nation that does not fight has rights in the world that belligerents or war cannot destroy, we have been strong in our neutrality and no one has made war on us because of that stand. Nations at war are busy with actual enemies. They do not deliberately attempt to turn neutrals into enemies.

#### MORALITY AT STAKE

Let's keep our thinking straight. Just because one nation attacks another and war begins, the warring states do not thereby gain all the rights to the whole earth. Neutrals still have rights and they still have duties. One of these rights is to protest wrongdoing and advantage-taking wherever it exists. You cannot be impartial if one combatant only commits the wrong. A referee in the prize ring must be neutral, and his neutrality makes him impartial as long as both fighters are fair, but when one fouls the referee must still remain neutral, he has no right to take part in the fight, but he need not be impartial and declare the fight a draw just because one man fouls. Without changing one bit his neutral position he penalizes the wrongdoer. His neutrality is preserved but his impartiality has gone. The rights of both fighters and the referee are all preserved. A neutrality that demands an impartiality calls for a dulling of every moral impulse. It insists upon erasing the line between good and evil. That is asking too much. That reduces a neutral to an unbearable impotence. A neutral has a right to stand for something in the world, not for nothing. If neutrality means a crushing of world morality it is better that we take sides and fight, because fighting for a right is better than passive submission to a wrong.

Now, Mr. President, let me ask a simple question? Is there a boy in a Mohammedan country who goes to Friday school, is there a boy in a Jewish country who goes to Saturday school, or is there a boy in a Christian country who goes to Sunday school, who would not accept the logic of fighting for what is right?

The whole essence of the great civilization, built upon these three great creeds, demands that of all of us. What is there startlingly wrong about a Senator of the United States declaring that, when the question is a question between right and wrong, I would rather fight than submit to a wrong? Does our oath mean nothing? Does the oath of an Army officer of the United States mean nothing? Simply because we are attempting to be just in a world where certain nations are at war, must we be impotent? Have we not some rights? Cannot we stand where Jefferson and Washington taught us to stand in the beginning of our evolution as a neutral nation? Jefferson said that the fact that two nations act like wolves toward each other is no reason why we have to take part in their fighting. The beginning of American neutrality was when we took the position that a neutral state had the right to exist in the world even when belligerent states were tearing each other to pieces.

Mr. President, reference has been made to a certain phrase as "a famous phrase." I do not know just why it should be so famous. It is in every international elementary textbook I have ever seen. That is the phrase, "take action



short of war." Yet some people thought President Roosevelt invented that phrase. I go so far as to say that our embargo under the provisions of our Neutrality Act is an act "short of war," if it is supposed to restrain belligerents, and not in any sense a warlike act.

I now come to another part of my radio address, and then I am through:

Study, too, will show that America is more united in opinion today than she was in 1914, but President Wilson's neutrality proclamation received the same wholehearted support from all our citizens in August 1914, as President Roosevelt's did today. Even ex-President Theodore Roosevelt, who later so strongly took sides and urged in the strongest terms that America should enter the war on the side of England and France, wrote during the first weeks of the war, "Of course it would be folly to jump into the gulf ourselves, and to no good purpose, and very probably nothing that we could have done would have helped Belgium. We have not the smallest responsibility for what has befallen her." (Outlook—September 23, 1914.)

Let us review the first days of the 1914 World War and our neutrality then. We will find much that is the same; still we will see a great difference. Then we assumed a European war was, after all, not of our concern. Today we may assert that but we know it is hardly true. The real truth in each case is and was that war anywhere is of universal concern. Peace, too, must be of universal concern. Regardless of what anyone may think or hope, the world is a unit in more ways than in its purely physical one.

Today no one expects anyone to be neutral in mind and thought. One Nation-wide poll on who is responsible for the present war shows that 82 percent of our people hold one side responsible. That does not give great promise for impartiality.

#### WHAT WILSON URGED

In 1914, President Wilson, 2 weeks after issuing his neutrality proclamation, said: "The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are trying men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle above another. My thought is of America—a Nation that neither sits in judgment upon others nor is disturbed in her own councils, and which keeps herself fit and free to do what is honest and disinterested and truly serviceable for the peace of the world."

Wilson's first statement and his proclamation were based upon the theory of neutrality as announced by Washington and Jefferson.

But proclamations and speeches do not alter facts. They are powerless when it comes to changing men's opinions. The people of our country were not "impartial in thought." Still they remained "neutral in fact" as far as actions were concerned for nearly 3 years. They stood on their rights and they condemned the wrongdoer. And while standing as a neutral their condemnation of a wrong did not take them into war. Had it done so we would have fought on both sides.

American neutrality has not been an unchanging thing from Washington's first neutrality proclamation to the present. It has grown and developed or it has become weak and supine, according to the emphasis. Sometimes neutral rights have been stressed, at other times neutral duties. There is an ocean of distance both in theory and fact between Jefferson's notion, that it was not the function of the Government to interfere with the economic affairs of the people and that as many people made their living in manufacturing arms their sale should not be prohibited, and the 1937 Neutrality Act. From the beginning to the present the American tendency has been to interpret neutrality to mean impartiality and to withdraw all moral judgment and base our stand of neutrality upon a simple rule of law instead of upon moral actions. It is nevertheless here where our neutrality has failed and we have turned to war. Therefore let's give up—

Here is where I suggest the giving up—

Therefore, let's give up the "impartial" dream which has never held when our sense of justice has been outraged, and place our neutrality upon the fundamental rights of a nation to carry on its peaceful pursuits even during war without being a party to the war. Whatever our neutrality has meant during the last 140 years, the right to stay at peace has been stronger than our dream of being impartial in thought, word, speech, and action.

Let us stand upon this platform—war between two or more nations cannot diminish the rights of any nation or nations that want to remain at peace. Maintain that stand upon a moral basis. Then American neutrality will stand and become the force in the world it should be.

#### RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock noon tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, OCTOBER 16, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, we would be like Him, who, with a consciousness deeper than the sea and higher than the stars, said calmly insistently: "I am the Way, the Truth, and the Life." Wilt Thou show us the path of life: "In Thy presence is fullness of joy; at Thy right hand are pleasures forever more." Let us begin this day with a fine impulse sweeping through our breasts, possessing a vision that conquers fears and immortalizes hopes. O Thou who art the purest of the mighty and the mightiest of the pure, who dost guide the worlds through space, cannot be less wise and kind than the shepherd who leads his flock into green pastures. In a world in which we hear so much of the roar of things and whose future no one can foretell, O may we have a place in the hollow of Thy hand where our souls may find whiteness and our minds unity. Through Christ our Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday, October 13, 1939, was read and approved.

#### GENERAL LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 3 calendar days in which to extend their own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. RANKIN. Including the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. RICH]. [Laughter.]

Mr. RICH. I would like to know what the idea of the gentleman is in making the request, because they all get permission to do it anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. My understanding is that we will probably adjourn over. We have been doing that. The RECORD will be printed every day, at any rate.

Mr. RICH. It would be a good thing if we did adjourn over, because if we had a roll call there would not be enough here to do business anyway.

Mr. RANKIN. I do not object to adjourning over, but if we do, I would like the Members to have that permission.

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, would this include remarks made before other bureaus and boards?

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Mississippi was that all Members may have the right for 3 calendar days to extend their own remarks in the RECORD. It would not include excerpts or extraneous matter.

Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. BLOOM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and insert a speech made by the Honorable Nicholas Murray Butler, president of Columbia University.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

#### ROTARY CLUB, BEDFORD, IND.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, in these turbulent days of wars, of mass murder, it is good to know that we live in the United States of America, a peace-loving Nation. It is good to know that we have institutions in our country which work for peace and better world understanding. I am a charter member of a club which has a local in my home town of Bedford, Ind. I have been a member continuously since its founding. The work of this club, locally, by districts, by

State, by Nation, and throughout the world works for peace, for harmony, for moral uplift, and works for better world acquaintanceship and world understanding. I refer to the Rotary Club. It has branches almost all over the world.

I recently had occasion to take up my attendance in far-away Oslo, Norway, while there at the recent Interparliamentary Union Conference. I found at Oslo the same fine personnel that I find in these clubs everywhere I go.

The reason I am bringing this matter to the attention of the House at this time is on account of a very splendid letter I have just received from my local club. I shall set it out and it is as follows:

BEDFORD ROTARY CLUB,  
BEDFORD, IND., October 12, 1939.

Hon. E. B. CROWE, M. C.,  
House Office Building, Room 1234, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: In recognition of your outstanding service to our community and the State of Indiana, the board of directors of Bedford Rotary Club has authorized me to confer upon you an honorary membership in the Bedford Rotary Club.

The honorary membership includes the privilege of attending all meetings, relieves the honoree of the necessity of the payment of dues, and waives the usual attendance requirements.

The board of directors wishes to take this means of expressing its appreciation of your past service and is happy to have you as an honorary member of the Bedford Rotary Club.

Rotarily yours,

BOARD OF DIRECTORS,  
Bedford Rotary Club.  
By JOHN D. WALLS,  
Secretary.

I consider this one of the finest honors that I have ever had bestowed upon me for the reason it does not come from some far-away group who only see me at my best but this recognition is from a group of good fellows with whom I have lived.

I have lived with many of them in this group for 25 or more years. I have lived with numerous ones of them before there was a Rotary Club in my town and accordingly have been with and around a number of them for 40 years. I, therefore, appreciate this nice honor more than words can express and my wish goes out to them and to all clubs of Rotary that it may continue its good work and ever be a continuous and lasting vehicle for good throughout the world.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by including a letter which I received from the Rotary Club of Bedford, Ind., my home town.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CROWE. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD a short address I made at the American Association of State Highway Officials in Richmond, Va., on October 10, 1939.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from California [Mr. HAVENNER] be granted leave of absence for 1 week.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein an editorial from the Detroit Free Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. FORD of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. McGEHEE] may have permission to extend his own remarks and include a short excerpt from a newspaper.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. THORKELSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 30 minutes on next Wednesday after business on the Speaker's desk has been disposed of.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Montana?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague [Mr. Wolcott] may have 20 minutes in which to address the House on next Wednesday, after any other special orders which may have been entered for that day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Boake Carter, appearing in the Evening Public Ledger of Philadelphia, September 29, 1939, entitled "The Second Surrender."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein a brief sermon entitled "The Christian Churches' Message to America," by Rev. Harry Emerson Fosdick, of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?  
There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House heretofore made, the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] is recognized for 30 minutes.

#### NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, on August 29 of this year I was in London. Rather late that evening in company with a colleague from Indiana, we started out to see some things of interest in that city. We had proceeded only a short distance when I saw something that reminded me of a similar incident some 22 years ago. We were attracted by two powerful beams of light directed into the sky. It was a moonlight night. Just a few lazy, fleecy clouds were floating over the sky, and these two beams of light had pinned an object which appeared to be about the size of my hand. It was a plane; it was a British plane. They evidently were trying out these beams of light. Along the streets were sandbags around the basements of buildings, and in windows, and there were trenches, pill boxes, and dugouts in the parks.

Twenty-two years ago in December I saw a hostile plane pinned between beams of light and heard the antiaircraft guns and the terrific explosions and the rapid-fire guns. The next morning I went out in company with British officials to see what damage had been done. Among other things, on the street where we were looking a laundry had been completely destroyed. Some 25 bombs were dropped that night in a section of the city where the working people lived. and I remember that scene. I took particular pains to measure one of the craters where a house had stood. The crater was 30 feet across and 12 feet deep. I saw women there, and children, some bandaged, shivering in the cold. They were homeless because a series of these houses had been destroyed by these bombs. That was war. That was the result of an air raid 22 years ago.

Later, crossing over into France and up near the Wichet sector, I visited 19 craters caused by explosives. They were of an average size of about 200 feet across and 40 feet deep. It took the British men 9 months to tunnel in under a hill occupied by the enemy there to deposit high explosives and ultimately to blast them into the infernal regions. Two hundred feet across and 40 feet deep. And the officers told me that in tunneling through to get under that hill during that 9 months' work there were places where they tunneled through 40 feet of putrid human flesh. That ground had been fought over, and fought over, and fought over. That was war in 1917.

I went to one of the base hospitals on the British front, a hospital which had a capacity of 3,000 men a day, where in 1 month 4,500 soldiers had gone in and out. They lived in terror of air raids every minute. That was in 1917, 22 years ago.

I remember riding toward the city of Perrone. I was not accustomed to seeing human ribs sticking out of the flat



ground swept clear of every living thing. It was pointed out to me that there had been a town there, but that day one was not able to see even a brick; everything was ground to powder. That was done with the instrumentalities of war in use 22 years ago.

During the last 22 years people have learned something about war, and they realize that scientists and officers have been engaged during all that time with all the resources available in chemical plants and laboratories to create new implements of human destruction. It is hard to conceive just what this next war is going to be. It might be interesting to you men to know that in the defense of Verdun alone—there are soldiers on the floor here who, of course, know all this; but it is just as well, perhaps, that the country should know it—the French sent 3,800,000 men to the defense of Verdun. They fired 18,000,000 shells during February and July 1916; and I saw the 7 miles that had been swept clean of every living tree and shrub. I saw shoes with the feet still in them. I would have you remember that since the close of the World War to 1930 there had been gathered from that battlefield alone, every day, seven cartloads of human bones to be deposited in a great monument erected there in memory of the men who died at Verdun. That was war then.

The question is: What was accomplished by that war or by our participation in it? I shall discuss this a little later, but I wanted to give you just a little picture of war back in those dark days, almost a quarter of a century ago.

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing the vast majority of the people of this country are agreed upon; they do not want war. A small, a very small, but a very powerful minority may desire war profits, although they profess to be for peace. I do not believe, in fact I cannot bring myself to believe, that businessmen generally want war for profits or otherwise. I fully realize that a great many people who abhor war and desire peace wish to see the Hitler regime defeated, and I am one of those who share this emotion; but here we must stop and think lest these unneutral thoughts, translated into unwise action, lead us into another foreign war. We cannot participate in the war without being a party to it.

The real issue involved is: What course should be pursued to keep this Nation from being drawn or led into the European war?

There is at present upon the statute books a neutrality law which went into effect August 31, 1935, and which was continued in force by the joint resolution of May 1, 1937. This country was at peace then and it is at peace right now with every nation in the world.

The existing neutrality statute was therefore introduced, debated, passed by both branches of Congress, and signed by President Franklin D. Roosevelt at a time of national peace. Thus this legislation was enacted, not in the heat of passion, prejudice, or partisanship, but in a spirit of calm deliberation and with an unanimity seldom displayed in both branches of Congress. The Neutrality Act was passed in the Senate by a vote of 63 to 6 and by a vote of 376 to 13 in the House of Representatives. Now in an hour of crisis, in an hour of passion, the Congress is asked to repudiate, to repeal this expressed will of a sovereign people, and return to international law, which brought about our entrance into the World War in 1917.

Is there anyone bold enough to dispute the fact that this Nation was operating under international law prior to and during the old World War? We can start with the premise that it was so operating as an established fact. That the United States sought to defend this same so-called international law with its men on land and sea and in the air and also loaned its money to the extent of over \$13,000,000,000 to foreign countries, which sum is not being repaid by any of the debtors except Finland, is also a factual matter of record. The United States has, in addition, paid for its championship of international law more than \$63,500,000,000. I ask, Are we going to be unneutral in order to engage in contraband commerce because of the supposed profits that may accrue to our country? I call attention to the fact that the gross value of all our exports from the

United States to Great Britain and France for the record-breaking year 1916 was only \$2,115,537,090, which was but one-ninth of the appropriations of the first session of the World War Congress. Are we to disregard the cost in human life, in suffering to the insane, the blind, the crippled, the tubercular, and the gassed victims of that war, all a part of the ghastly result of endeavoring to police the world in the name of international law? This is, in part, the answer to those who seek to repeal the present Neutrality Act, which we enacted as a safeguard against a repetition of our former mistake, and which is performing the function for which it was enacted.

Now, the propaganda artillery has been brought into action to deter honest citizens who express their views in support of the arms embargo to their duly elected representatives in Washington, much as the propaganda machinery is used to suppress individual opinions and free speech abroad. The few who are on the stage shouting "peace under the cash-and-carry plan" know that behind the scenes the instruments of war are being made and sharpened for wholesale throat cutting and blood letting abroad under the sanctity of international law.

Those who really desire to keep this Nation out of war must strip the issue of all hypocrisy now masquerading under the banner of cash and carry. Let us examine the record and see how much reliance can be placed on peace talk by those who insist upon the repeal of the present Neutrality Act as a means of insuring peace. This is not the first time that "peace" has been the slogan under circumstances not dissimilar to the present. I call attention to some peace oratory, most persuasive and sufficiently convincing to achieve not its avowed purpose but to attain quite another objective. I invite attention to the speech of ex-Governor Glynn, of New York, as temporary chairman and keynote speaker at the Democratic Convention at St. Louis in 1916. I assume there are a few men in the Congress who were then present and heard this stirring address:

The United States is constrained—

Said Governor Glynn—

by the traditions of its past, by the logic of its present, and by the promise of its future, to hold itself apart from the conflict that now devastates the nations across the seas.

I am sure that those who heard him then were thrilled as he warmed to his subject and entered the realm of politics in his stirring flights of oratory on the subject of peace:

Fighting for every degree of injury—

Said the Governor—

would mean perpetual war, and this is the policy of our opponents, deny how they will. It would not allow the United States to keep the sword in the scabbard as long as there remains an unrighted wrong or an unsatisfied hope between the snowy wastes of Siberia or the jungled hills of Borneo. It would give us a war abroad each time the fighting cock of the European weather vane shifted with the breeze. It would make America the cockpit of the world. It would mean the reversal of our traditional policy of government. It would mean the adoption of imperialistic doctrines which we have denounced for over a century. \* \* \* In a word, the policy of our opponents would make the United States the policeman of the world. Rome tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Portugal tried to be policeman of the world and went down; Spain tried and went down; and the United States proposes to profit by the experience of the ages and avoid ambitions whose reward is sorrow and whose crown is death.

I remind my colleagues that the Government at that time failed to "profit by the experience of the ages," but now that we have paid the price by not heeding the experience of the ages, it will be well for us and for the people to profit by our experience of 23 years ago.

Mr. Speaker, this is no time for those who desire peace to be lulled into a sense of false security by dramatic phrases while the citadel of neutrality is torn down by those who seek fool's gold under a cash-and-carry plan. What is it in the Neutrality Act of 1935 that is objectionable? In substance, the main points of the act are these:

First. An embargo upon the export of arms, munitions, and implements of warfare to all belligerents.

Second. A system of registration of munitions manufacturers and of licensing munitions exports under the supervision of a National Munitions Board.

Third. Delegation of power to the President to (a) withhold protection from any American citizen traveling on any vessel of any belligerent nation if he considers it advisable; (b) prohibit the entrance of any foreign submarine during war into American ports or territorial waters except under conditions prescribed by the President; (c) require bond of vessels suspected of leaving American port for the purpose of delivering up to any belligerent warship or supply ship men or fuel, munitions, or other supplies.

If this act were not working and doing precisely what it was intended to do, there would be no proposal here at the present time to destroy it. I am not surprised that so many people are perplexed by the present proposal of President Roosevelt, in view of what he said on August 14, 1936, at Chautauqua, N. Y., a great educational center located in the congressional district which I have the honor to represent. On this occasion President Roosevelt warned his audience that:

Industrial and agricultural production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

President Roosevelt went on to say:

Nevertheless, if war should break out again in another continent, let us not blink the fact that we would find in this country thousands of Americans who, seeking immediate riches—fool's gold—would attempt to break down or evade our neutrality. They would tell you—and, unfortunately, their views would get wide publicity—that if they could produce and ship this and that and the other article to belligerent nations, the unemployed of America would all find work.

What could lead to greater bewilderment and confusion on the part of the public than to find President Roosevelt now leading the forces seeking repeal of the Neutrality Act and holding out the inducement in his message to Congress on September 21, 1939. To quote from that message, it was this:

From a purely material point of view, what is the advantage to us in sending all manner of articles across the ocean for final processing there when we would give employment to thousands doing it here?

I do admit that this is a very tempting morsel of hope to hold out to 10,000,000 unemployed. It is an almost irresistible psychological appeal to personal self-interest. The same thread of psychological inducement ran through many of the peace talks delivered throughout the country in 1916.

I quote from some of the speeches made by President Woodrow Wilson at that time:

I pledge you that, God helping me, I will keep you out of war. (Milwaukee speech.)

There is a moral obligation laid upon us to keep free the courses of our commerce and our finance, and I believe that America stands ready to vindicate those rights (Topeka speech).

One commander of a submarine might set the world on fire. There are cargoes of cotton on the seas; there are cargoes of wheat on the seas; there are cargoes of manufactured articles on the seas, and one of those cargoes may be the point of ignition (St. Louis speech).

There is one thing Kansas ought to be interested in, and that is that we must maintain our rights to sell our products to any neutral country anywhere in the world. We should be allowed to send the wheat that grows on the Kansas fields and the cotton in our Southern States to neutrals who need them, without interference from any of the warring nations (Topeka speech).

I shall ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the professions of peace recently uttered by the leaders of the countries now at war in Europe. I wish to cite a few examples on this point:

Mr. Baldwin: The fight (for peace and the League of Nations) is worth it, and it is a fight that this country has been engaged in for some years and is engaged in now, and will continue in for centuries if need be (The Times, March 25, 1935).

Mr. Laval: Our country does not fear war, as I have said at Geneva, but it hates it (The Times, April 14, 1936).

Mr. Blum: The Front Populaire Government . . . will make every effort to establish real security in the world, a security based on "disarmed peace" (Manchester Guardian, May 8, 1936).

Herr Hitler: The National Socialists . . . have a gigantic program at home. That obliges us to seek peace and friendship with the rest of the world (The Times, June 19, 1934).

Signor Mussolini expressed his views in Rome, October 27, 1930: "Let it be clear, however, that we are arming ourselves spiritually and materially in order to defend ourselves, not in order to attack. Fascist Italy will never take the initiative of war" (George Seldes, *Sawdust Caesar* 1936, p. 385).

Subsequent events make a hollow mockery out of all these reiterated professions as to a real desire for peace.

We cannot depend on these so-called peace assurances. The general responsibility for the situation so far as the United States is concerned rests with this Congress, and it is by our acts, not by our speeches alone, that the issue of war or peace will be determined.

There was a time when as a student, studying the subject, I thought international law was something very sacred and the last refuge of protection for a neutral nation. It is well to remember, however, that this Government was endeavoring to operate under international law prior to the last war. Yes; more than that, the Government entered the war to defend the principle of international law. In support of this, I quote the unyielding position taken by President Wilson, as stated by him to Senator Stone on February 24, 1916:

Once accept a single abatement of right—

Said President Wilson—

and many other humiliations would certainly follow and the whole fine fabric of international law would crumble under our hands, piece by piece.

I assert that one of the major contributing factors to the participation of the United States in the World War was an attempt on our part to champion international law, and we even went so far as to attempt to maintain the rights of other neutrals under it. The Nation is now asked to follow the same course which, 22 years ago, cost the lives of 126,000 of our men, thousands of crippled and blind and, as I have stated and which I repeat for sake of emphasis, the sum of \$63,500,000,000, including a debt for money loaned to foreign nations amounting to more than \$13,000,000,000.

I ask: Did the World War bring anything more than a temporary inflationary rise to the price of farm products? What has been the condition of the farmers since the World War? The farmers know the answer. Is it necessary to describe the condition of industry and of the working men and women when a few years later the final backwash of the war struck our shores?

President Roosevelt told my friends at Chautauqua on August 14, 1936, when he addressed himself to "War profits as a lure," that—

Nevertheless—and I speak from long experience—the effective maintenance of American neutrality depends today, as in the past, on the wisdom and determination of whoever at the moment occupy the offices of President and Secretary of State.

It is clear—

Said the President—

that our present policy and the measures passed by the Congress would, in the event of war on some other continent, reduce war profits which would otherwise accrue to American citizens.

I would remind my colleagues that the President was addressing himself to the Neutrality Act which it is now sought to repeal. Continuing, the President said:

Industrial and agriculture production for a war market may give immense fortunes to a few men; for the Nation as a whole it produces disaster.

It was the prospect of war profits that made our farmers in the West plow up prairie land that should never have been plowed, but should have been left for grazing cattle. Today we are reaping the harvest of those war profits in the dust storms which have devastated those war-plowed areas.

Then the President reminded the Chautauqua audience that—

It was the prospect of war profits that caused the extension of monopoly and unjustified expansion of industry, and a price level so high that the normal relationship between debtor and creditor is destroyed.

I am sure that this indictment of war profits gained from the sale of goods to belligerent nations should be a deterrent to the adoption of the present proposal of President Roosevelt, which would again inflict such penalties upon the people of this country.



Cash and carry is a delusion and a snare, the purpose of which is not neutrality, but war profits and nothing else except to favor one group of nations against another. The extension of credit, in other words, loans, is the entering wedge to war. The Democratic Congressional Campaign Book of 1914 contained the views expressed by Secretary of State Bryan on this very question. I quote from Secretary Bryan's explanation, as follows:

It is inconsistent with the spirit of neutrality for a neutral nation to make loans to belligerent nations, for money is the worst of contrabands; it commands all other things. A very forcible illustration has been used in support of this proposition, namely, that as a neutral government does all in its power to discourage its citizens from enlisting in the armies of other countries, it should discourage those who, by loaning money, would do more harm than they could do by enlisting. The Government withdraws the protection of citizenship from those who enlist under other flags—why should it give protection to money when it enters into foreign military service? There is only one answer.

The policy recommended by Secretary Bryan was not followed. Subsequent events, however, demonstrated its practical wisdom.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. The gentleman stated a moment ago that this cash-and-carry plan would favor one side against the other. Of course, he meant it would favor France and England. I am wondering, and I ask the gentleman if it is not true, that if this cash-and-carry plan is applied to all, with the Atlantic Ocean teeming with submarines and airplanes, and the Pacific Ocean open, would it not be easier to transport these munitions across the Pacific Ocean through Russia into Germany probably than it would to transport them across the Atlantic Ocean to England and France.

Mr. REED of New York. I will answer the gentleman in this way. I do not claim to be an expert on war transportation. This is one of the most highly involved technical subjects. The way the gentleman states it, it would be a possibility were it not for the fact that under the arms embargo such shipments could not be made to either Germany or Russia because each one of them is in debt to the United States. They would come under the provision of the Johnson Act. The Treasury reports show that both Germany and Russia are debtors to the United States.

I ask, will not the cash-and-carry, or credit-and-carry plan, even though the contraband is carried in foreign ships, bring the war to our shore? One writer, Walter Lippmann, contends that the repeal of the arms embargo makes it much more certain that the war will remain 3,000 miles from our shores.

Mr. RICH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. Was it not the idea of this cash-and-carry plan that all commodities that were destined for belligerent nations should be carried on foreign ships?

Mr. REED of New York. That would make the situation no different. When they struck the 3-mile line, they would have the naval forces of belligerent countries camped along there, as they are hovering on one coast now, in the expectation that this embargo clause will be repealed.

Mr. RICH. They would not have to sink any American ships?

Mr. REED of New York. What would happen? Let me finish this and I will answer the gentleman's question right here.

I maintain that if we should establish ourselves as an arsenal for warring nations, such a program is an invitation to every hostile battleship and submarine to hover along our shore just beyond the 3-mile limit and wait until its cash-and-carry prey leaves one of our harbors and crosses the line, and when the stern of the ship crosses the international 3-mile line, then and there the bombardment will begin. There will be disputes as to whether hostilities were begun within or without the international limits. To protect our own neutral waters and our own shores, our Navy and air

force will be called upon to take a hand, and plain common sense ought to convince anyone that such a course of policing will eventually lead to international controversies and to war.

The range of these guns firing on the 3-mile line will endanger every harbor where there are cash-and-carry ships.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Are not the submarines hovering around our shores now looking for ships carrying munitions of war?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; they are hovering there, and they have had an invitation to hover there.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Would they do it any more on account of repealing this embargo clause?

Mr. REED of New York. When we become a great arsenal, of course they will.

Mr. MICHENER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman has made reference to the 3-mile limit. In making that reference, has he taken into consideration the fact that certain officials of this country have declared a 300-mile limit as new international law?

Mr. REED of New York. Yes; taking in 13 British possessions.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. This country has not declared that. Our multimillionaire Under Secretary of State, Mr. Sumner Welles, not an authority on international law or national law, has declared the "Sumner Welles" 300-mile limit.

Mr. REED of New York. But that was the outcome of the conference held at Panama.

If we should repeal the arms embargo and convert our industries into arsenals for the prosecution of the European war, can we not foresee the placing of heavy guards at our railroad bridges, around munitions plants, and war industries in an attempt to prevent the inevitable sabotage and explosions incident to the manufacture and transportation of arms and munitions in time of war? Thus, we bring upon ourselves many of the tragedies of war instead of keeping the curse of war 3,000 miles from our shore.

Mr. Speaker, at this point I ask unanimous consent to insert a list of the explosions, the loss of life, and the millions of dollars of property that was destroyed as a result of operations in this country before we declared war in 1917. This occurred because we were supplying munitions of war under international law.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. REED]?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to follows:

LIST OF MAJOR EXPLOSIONS AND FIRES IN AMERICAN MUNITIONS PLANTS AND FACTORIES SUPPLYING MUNITIONS OF WAR DURING THE PERIOD FROM AUGUST 1914 TO 1917

(Source: The German Secret Service in America, 1914-18, by John Price Jones and Paul Merrick Hollister. Publishers: Small, Maynard & Co.)

1914

August 30. Explosion in the powder mill of the Du Pont Powder Co., at Pompton Lakes, N. J.

September. Explosion in the guncotton section of the Wright Chemical Works. Three deaths and large property damage.

October. Explosion in the factory of the Pain Fireworks Display Co. Several deaths and destruction of the plant. Explosion in the fireworks factory of Detwiller & Street in Jersey City. Four deaths and much property damage.

1915

January 1. Fire in Buckthorne plant of the John A. Roebling Co., makers of shells, at Trenton, N. J. The \$1,500,000 plant was completely destroyed.

January-June. Du Pont Factories at Haskell, N. J., Carneys Point, N. J., Wayne, Pa., and Wilmington, Del. experienced fires and explosions. A chemical explosion occurred in a factory in East Nineteenth Street, New York. Explosion in the Anderson Chemical Co., Wallington, N. J., guncotton plant. Three lives lost. Explosion in the Equitable powder plant at Alton, Ill. Five deaths.

May 30. Explosion on a barge laden with dynamite in the harbor of Seattle, Wash. Widespread damage.

June 26. Explosion in the Aetna powder plant at Pittsburgh. One man killed and 10 others injured.

July. Explosion of a tank of phenol at a plant in New York City. Explosion at the benzol plant of the Semet Solvay Co. at Solvay, N. Y. Factory destroyed. Incendiary fires at the Midvale Steel Co. plant; at the shell plant of the Brill Car Co.; in the Southwark Machinery Co.; and in the shell department of the Diamond Forge and Steel Co.

July 7. Explosion in the Du Pont powder factory at Pompton Lakes, N. J. Explosion in the benzol plant of Harrison Bros., Philadelphia; \$500,000 damage.

July 16. Explosion and fire at the Aetna powder plant at Sinemahoning, Pa. Five deaths.

July 19. Explosion at the Wilmington plant of the Du Pont Co. July 25. Munitions train on the Pennsylvania line blown up at Metuchen, N. J.

July 28. Explosion again hits the Du Pont works at Wilmington.

July 29. Explosion of glaze mill in the American Powder Co. at Acton, Mass. Mill destroyed.

August. Powder flash in the Bethlehem Steel Co. Ten deaths. Explosion trainload of dynamite from Du Pont works at Pinole, Calif.

September. Explosion in the Curtiss Airplane plant at Depew, N. Y. Explosions in the shell factory of the National Cable & Conduit Co., at Hastings, N. Y. Explosion of benzol and wax in the plant of Smith & Lenhart, New York; two workers seriously injured. Explosion in fireworks factory at North Bergen, N. J.; two people killed. Explosion in the shell factory of the Westinghouse Electric Co. at Pittsburgh; two dead.

September-October. Repeated explosions at Du Pont plants, with extensive damage. Explosions at the plants of the Aetna Powder Co.

November. Two explosions in the Tennessee Coal & Iron Works at Birmingham, Ala., causing large property damage.

November 10. Fire in the plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co. that destroyed 800 big guns. (All Germans warned beforehand.)

December. Explosion of ton and a half of nitroglycerin at Fayetteville, Ill.

December 10. Explosion at Hopewell, N. J., plant of the Du Pont powder works; \$2,000,000 worth of damage.

1916

January-April. Several major explosions in the Du Pont properties alone; dozens of lives lost. Explosion destroyed two arms plants in Bridgeport, Conn.

May. Explosion wiped out a large chemical plant in Cadillac, Mich. Explosion destroyed a munitions plant of the Bethlehem Steel Co., at New Castle, Pa.

August 1. Two million pounds of munitions blown up at Black Tom Island, in New York Harbor; \$30,000,000 damage.

1917

January 11. Fire and explosion in the shell-assembly plant of the Canadian Car & Foundry Co. near Kingsland, N. J.; half a million 3-inch shells discharged; \$17,000,000 damage to the plant and ammunition.

According to the German Secret Service in America, in 1915 a total of \$62,000,000 was charged to fires of unknown causes, in addition to \$6,200,000 paid out by insurance companies for incendiary fires. In 1916 this total jumped to over \$100,000,000 (p. 134).

One agent alone, Von Rintelen, boasted that he had been sent to America by the German general staff "backed by \$50,000,000—yes, \$100,000,000;" that he was "an agent plenipotentiary and extraordinary, ready to take any measure on land and sea to stop the making of munitions to halt their transportation at the factory or at the seaboard."

#### SUMMARY

This list shows a total of 53 major explosions and fires in American plants supplying arms and munitions of war to Allies before the United States entered the first World War.

Of this total, 33 explosions occurred in powder plants or on munitions trains. Twelve accidents happened in gun or shell plants. Chemical factories producing items used in war accounted for 7 explosions, while 1 disaster occurred in an airplane plant.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. LEWIS of Ohio. Just last night I learned that the Baltimore & Ohio is already guarding its bridges over the Ohio River between Ohio and West Virginia, and is not that as the result of such outrages as we had in 1917?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, finally, the question is whether we are going to be neutral or unneutral. What is neutrality? It is defined as "refraining from interference in a contest; friendly to each of two or more belligerents, or at least not taking part of either or any; as a neutral power."

Or it may be stated in the language of the authorities as follows:

The state of being neutral: The state of being a neutral nation during war. Neutrals may not lend money to either side, guarantee a loan, or allow the passage of belligerent troops through their borders.

Our Nation, which is neutral, should be steadfast in adhering to it and not be stirred from this position of security by any specious arguments or impassioned oratory. Strict neutrality and profits and advantages to one group of belligerents over another cannot be reconciled nor harmonized. I believe that strict neutrality is the surest, the safest, and the one means by which the United States can avoid war. To relax the rules, established during a period of peace, as a means of helping one group of belligerents to the injury of another belligerent group is anything but neutral conduct on our part. To alter the Neutrality Act as a means of financial gain shows a lack of honor and self-respect for the good name of our country.

I maintain that there is no vital national interest, profits or otherwise, to be gained by enacting sham legislation which is neither neutral in theory nor in fact. I was taught in high school that:

"This above all: To thine own self be true,  
And it must follow, as the night the day,  
Thou canst not then be false to any man."

This applies to nations as well as to individuals.

The idea that the present European war is a war to end all wars ought to be weighed in the light of what Lord Allenby, the distinguished British general, said in his last message:

Wars have been usually waged, in olden days, for the spoils of victory; increase of territory, acquisition of wealth, even glory to the victor. The lust for expansion is not yet quite dead; but the glory of conquest is departing; its gains are dead sea fruit; its legacy, revengeful memories alone; hardening hearts, perpetuating anger, and leading on to the dreary round of renewed wars.

Mr. Speaker, I now wish to direct the attention of the House to another much-debated phase of this proposed legislation. What is it that we wish to sell? Why not furnish a bill of particulars, that the public may know what the advocates of cash and carry wish to sell? Is this Christian Nation, under the term of neutrality, to deliver for cash or for credit these deadly poison gases: Chlorine, chloropicrin, phosgene tear gas, toxic smoke, and mustard gas? There is no doubt we can manufacture a new deadly product in the form of clay, impregnated with poison gas, which by a new diabolical system can be sprayed from the air in the form of powder.

Mr. Speaker, I have never seen the victims of the more modern methods of taking human life, but I remember going into a British hospital at the front, and I saw the victims brought into a large room, about half as large as this Chamber. The cots were placed side by side, and oxygen gas was being administered to these boys who were fighting for one more breath. They were a long way from home. The wheezing and coughing of these poison-gas victims was enough to rack one's heart and soul. The lining of the nose had been eaten away. Many of the boys had no eyelids left, just their big, round eyes glaring and bulging from the pain of the poison gas. These were the boys who, 22 years ago, were fighting to end wars. I do not intend to lend my voice or my vote to any plan which proposes to engage in the manufacture and sale of these devilish, deadly, inhuman instrumentalities for mass murder.

So we are going in to sell that because there is a profit in it. Some may cry out, "Is it just to embargo the implements of mass murder when we can make profits from them? Is it just when these countries owe us and we have an opportunity to collect?" Oh, I would answer that in these words, that justice is a fine word, but it is not the last word between man and man.

To so order the world that every man receives a just wage will not bring the millennium. Who pays the mother for her long night vigil, the father for his toil, the soldier for his wounds, the hero for giving up his life to rescue another? Who paid Jesus for His agony, Regulus for his patriotism, and Walt Whitman for his poetry? Above all work done for fair pay towers the work done for no pay at all—just for love.

If we have a spark of love in our hearts at all for humanity, for innocent women and children, we will not seek profits by selling the instrumentalities of wholesale murder, and that is what we propose to do by lifting this embargo.



Mr. Speaker, I am not interested in the profit that can be made by manufacturing and selling to our overseas neighbors the thermite bomb, weighing 5 pounds or less, which can be scattered over a city at large. A whole city, with favoring winds, can be destroyed by this instrument of refined cruelty. Thermite will burn through steel and through the successive floors of buildings so that modern architectural construction, only fireproof in the ordinary sense of the word, will be no adequate protection against it. It cannot be quenched with water. These are only a few of the sources of profit to be gained by becoming particeps criminis in a foreign war.

There should be no hypocrisy, no subterfuge, and no duplicity in dealing with this subject of neutrality. If it is the intention to favor one group of belligerents, then let the advocates of intervention be honest about it and say they wish to help one side whose cause they consider just. That will bring the issue clearly into the open where it belongs.

I maintain that the neutrality law is performing the function for which it was designed, whereas the old weapon of international law utterly failed in the World War. I listened intently for the President's explanation of his "conviction" that the repeal of the arms embargo would more probably keep us out of war. He said:

I give to you my deep and unalterable conviction \* \* \* that by the repeal of the embargo the United States will more probably remain at peace than if the law remains as it stands today. I say this because with the repeal of the embargo this Government clearly and definitely will insist that American citizens and American ships keep away from the immediate perils of the actual zones of conflict.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from New York be extended 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, and I shall not object, I should like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. REED of New York. Ask it now.

Mr. BULWINKLE. All right; I shall not object, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. BULWINKLE. The gentleman said he would insert in the Record a list of the industrial plants and other facilities destroyed by the Germans before we entered the last war. Why is the gentleman inserting that list in the Record?

Mr. REED of New York. Does not the gentleman perceive the logic of it? Does the gentleman mean to bring the war right into our country, a neutral country?

Mr. BULWINKLE. Is the gentleman, then, inserting it in order that everybody may be fearful that if we pass this neutrality bill the Germans will again start on a course of sabotage in America?

Mr. REED of New York. Of course, they will, and so will any other country to which we are unneutral.

Mr. BULWINKLE. Then, in fear that someone might destroy our industries, we should stand supinely by and let them do what they please?

Mr. REED of New York. No; we should be neutral and not invite just that sort of thing, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REED of New York. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. RICH. What difference does it make if we refrain from shipping munitions of war already assembled if we permit the shipment to foreign countries of the necessary commodities and permit them to be manufactured over there?

Mr. REED of New York. The point is that if we are going to be neutral we must stop the shipment of the commodities that are declared to be contraband of war by the belligerent nations.

Mr. RICH. Would that include any commodities that might be used for the manufacture of anything that might endanger the lives of people after they are shipped from this country?

Mr. REED of New York. For wholesale slaughter; yes.

Mr. RICH. Then the gentleman would limit the shipment of all such commodities?

Mr. REED of New York. I would remain absolutely neutral. I do not know what the gentleman's interest is in shipping goods abroad, but I will say that all we shipped during 1916 and was just one-twentieth of 1 percent of our domestic and foreign commerce, just one-twentieth of 1 percent; and for that you would engage in wholesale slaughter of civilians abroad and bring the war to our own shores.

Mr. RICH. The gentleman referred to my attitude in making that statement, and I wish to say right here that if any manufacturing concern in this country is making profits out of war, I will be the first one to vote that no manufacturer in this country shall make a penny of profit out of any war commodity.

Mr. REED of New York. Good; I am glad to hear that.

Mr. ALLEN of Pennsylvania and Mr. PATRICK rose.

Mr. REED of New York. I have only 5 minutes; let me finish my statement. I say in answer that this safeguard can most certainly be accomplished without the repeal of the arms embargo. The two propositions have no relationship whatsoever to each other. I heartily agree with Senator VANDENBERG, who said, in answer to this proposal:

It is solely the question why, in God's name, is it necessary for us to reject a complete embargo upon munitions of war in order to accept what you propose? And I have yet to hear one side of a rational answer to the question.

Mr. Speaker, we, representing 130,000,000 people, have a responsibility, and one that is primarily ours and not that of any other branch of the Federal Government. That responsibility is to keep this country out of a foreign war, and, by so doing, preserve our liberties and our institutions. If we register the will of those whom we represent, we shall have their cooperation to that end. I can find no more appropriate words in which to define our responsibility than those used by Maj. George Fielding Eliot, who served with the Australian Imperial Force for the period of the World War, and who was major of Military Intelligence Reserve of the United States Army from 1922 to 1930. He said:

In this country we have a very great responsibility—a responsibility to which it is difficult to believe the American people will be found insensible. That responsibility is to keep alive in this world the torch of human liberty when elsewhere that light is being ruthlessly trodden out. We can do that; we can carry out this responsibility because a merciful Providence has favored this country with a geographical position which enables us to defend ourselves with the weapons of sea power which are historically weapons that a free people may wield without peril to their liberty.

If, however, we throw away these advantages, if we again undertake military adventures of a type calling for the regimentation of every aspect of national life and resources, if we attempt to go again to other continents to settle the affairs of other peoples with great armies and the great measure of shipping necessary to maintain those armies overseas, we shall be abandoning the responsibility which is ours, and which, first of all, consists in making secure our own freedom, our own democracy, our institutions, and our way of life. We must realize that in Europe, where a number of nations live side by side on a comparatively small continent, there is nothing we can do to contribute to a permanent settlement of European affairs. We can only produce a new set of combinations out of which, in turn, will presently arise the beginnings of a new war. We cannot settle the affairs of Europe in a manner which justifies the expenditure of life and treasure that it would cost us.

The affairs of Europe can be settled only when the peoples of Europe have made up their minds that war is not worth while. But we cannot convince them of that. They will have to convince themselves. The only policy for the American people to adopt may be stated in these words: "The affairs of Europe and Asia must be settled by the peoples who live there; the affairs of the Americas shall be settled by the people who live here, and by no one else."

[Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a statement I made this morning before the Committee for Reciprocity Information.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent that my colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERGUSON] be permitted to extend his remarks in the RECORD and include therein the statement he submitted to the Committee for Reciprocity Information this morning.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEAVY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an address delivered by the Attorney General of the United States, last Friday evening, before a conference on civil liberties.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Washington?

There was no objection.

Mr. THOMAS F. FORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article which appeared in the Washington Post of yesterday.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. BROWN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the McConnelville, Ohio, Herald.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD by including a letter I received from Mr. Goodloe, of the Commodity Credit Corporation, dated October 14, a letter which he addressed to certain warehousemen, dated October 7, and a cotton storage contract.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include an article from the Portland Spectator on neutrality.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oregon?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under a previous order of the House the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. COURTNEY] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### NEUTRALITY

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, I think I should offer an apology to this body for asking recognition on the floor at so early a time in my first session. I realize, of course, that ordinarily a new Member should listen and learn in this body for a longer period than I have before endeavoring to offer his views and arguments for or against pending measures. However, as a new member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, as a Member of this body, and as a citizen, I am deeply and vitally interested in the neutrality legislation.

I trust therefore, Mr. Speaker, that these considerations will outweigh in your mind and in the minds of the Members any feeling that may exist as to the impropriety of my rising at this time.

The request, Mr. Speaker, that I am about to make at this point has been mentioned to the two gentlemen who follow me under special orders and they have no objection. I ask unanimous consent at this point that my time be extended so that I may have a total of 35 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Tennessee?

There was no objection.

Mr. COURTNEY. Another consideration that impelled me to speak is the disclosure made on the floor of the House the other day that some forty-odd Republican Members of this body and one Democrat, under the chairmanship of the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] have

organized themselves into a committee, styled the National Committee To Keep Us Out of Foreign Wars. The headquarters of this organization being in the House Office Building, and the stationery used being, to some extent at least, official, the public may easily believe that this self-appointed committee has some official standing. This committee or bureau, or whatever it may be properly called, is broadcasting appeals for money to be used, it is admitted, for propaganda purposes to try to browbeat those of us who do not see eye to eye with them as to how to keep us out of war, into their point of view. I do not impugn the motives of these gentlemen. They are honorable men and honestly followed the dictates of their consciences, I am sure.

But they are endeavoring to set themselves up as the only patriots in this body and the only Members whose high ambition it is to keep this country out of war. I resent such action, and with letters from this committee going into my district I could not keep silent and maintain my self-respect. And when the distinguished gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. WOODRUM], whose statesmanship and ability is known throughout the Nation, took this alliance to task on the floor the other day for degrading the dignity of this body, their only answer was the unwarranted suggestion that he was estopped to speak because, forsooth, he had not fought in the World War, as well he should not have in view of the important public position he then held.

If a personal reference will be excused, I will match records for patriotism with any member of that so-called committee. I served in the last war as a private and an officer in an infantry regiment that saw 6 months of fighting at the front. Out of the first 100 officers we took into the line, 74 were killed or wounded, and casualties among the enlisted men ran to almost 50 percent. I know what war is, and I hate war with every fiber of my being. I hope that no American will ever again be called on to stand on foreign soil, beneath steel-throbbing skies, to see the earth battered to pieces beneath the hammer strokes of the howitzers and to see high explosives tear and mangle and kill human beings.

Furthermore, in my recent campaign for a seat in this body I told my constituents, and here renew the pledge, that I will never vote to send America into this war unless further developments bring about a cause so just and righteous in my mind that immediately on voting for war I will myself enlist in the armed forces of the country.

With that indication of the sincerity of my desire to preserve peace for this country, you can understand my resentment at the action of this partisan, political National Committee To Keep Us Out of Foreign Wars in advising my constituents, in effect, that I am by my attitude on this legislation trying to embroil America in the war in Europe.

Referring now to the neutrality bill that will come to us for consideration shortly, I have been astonished at the light and airy manner with which this subject has been treated by some in both Houses. On the Senate side newspapers quote statesmen there as saying "we are going to fight this thing from hell to breakfast." There, and in this House, too, Members have been quoted as seriously advancing the amazing argument that "we must not change the rules during the progress of the game," all as though a football contest is being fought or rules being prescribed for a tennis match. As we debate this subject here men are dying horribly by the thousands. Our action on this bill may affect the future of all the people of Europe, and it strikes me that arguments made by these men with hearts so little attuned to the tragedy and doom of the day should be lightly considered in this debate.

There has been as much or more misrepresentation about this bill, intentional and unintentional, I dare say, than about any other bill ever before the Congress. While at home, between the sessions, I took the opportunity of explaining in detail through the press of my district the bill we considered last session—practically the same as the bill that will shortly come to us. Then I visited the 12 counties of my district. I represent a rural district in Tennessee, called the Volunteer State, because in every war it has supplied more than its quota of volunteers, but a State whose citizenship abhors war. The people of my district are intelligent and cultured.



Some of the finest schools in the South are located there, and there are few homes that do not have the benefit of the radio and daily papers. It is a fair cross section of the real America, uninfluenced by aliens and rabble rousers, and thinking for itself. I contacted people in all walks of life—merchants, bankers, men of general business, professional men, farmers, and laborers. It may seem to you an exaggeration, but I give my solemn word that I did not find a single human being that did not favor the enactment of the principle of the proposed bill. Since my return to Washington I have not received a single letter from my district asking me to vote in the negative. I hear other Members of this body speak of the hundreds of letters requesting a negative vote. A few of them, of course, are from people who honestly voice their own sentiments, but in the light of my experience I firmly believe that 95 percent of these letters are from people who do not understand the situation and have been inspired to write by misdirected zealots or from people favoring Germany in this war through considerations of blood or affinity.

Leaving aside the arms-embargo feature of the proposed bill for the present, to defeat it would be to leave this country in a position best calculated to lead us into war, for under the law now existing American ships can carry any commodity under the sun, even articles declared contraband, right into the ports of the warring nations, except arms, ammunition, and munitions of war. It was that privilege to American shippers that led directly to our entrance into the last war. As was stated here by the distinguished gentleman from Texas [Mr. JOHNSON] a few days ago, under the German unrestricted submarine warfare 26 of our ships were sunk, and when our national pride could endure it no longer we declared war. Only one of those ships carried anything resembling munitions of war. Some carried wheat, some timber, some assorted cargoes, but not munitions of war. As the law now exists, with German submarines roaming the seas again, and with our ships putting out daily with cargoes on the German contraband list, we are in an easy way to go exactly the same route that we went in 1917.

The proposed law stops that and prevents our ships from passing through or into combat areas, but permits the warring nations to come here in their own ships and buy whatever we have to sell on a cash-and-carry basis; and with agricultural conditions as they are and industrial conditions as well, with the list of unemployed of staggering size, certainly our farmers and our manufacturers need to sell. Our shipping industry must make a sacrifice, of course, but it is necessary to keep us out of war and therefore well worth while.

Objection is made that there is a 90-day credit feature in the new bill. In business circles everywhere 90 days is almost equivalent to cash, and in large transactions some time must be given for transfer of credits, clearances, and the like. But there is the provision that should a nation default on one such extension, no further sale will be made during the default. In the emergency the warring nations confront, that provision will be a penalty so severe that, in my opinion, there will be no default.

It is said that the cash feature will not avail us because England and France are unable to buy on such terms. Nothing could be further from the real facts. According to the current monthly review of the National City Bank of New York, England has some four and one-half billions in gold and dollar assets and France three and one-half billions, and this could be supplemented by their sale of securities internally to an almost unlimited amount.

Another likely cause of our entry into the war would be the taking of American lives by one of the warring nations. The proposed bill carries over the feature prohibiting the travel by Americans on ships of warring nations and prohibits any American, and, of course, any American passenger ship, from passing through or into the combat areas. Another sacrifice of our national right, of course; but in a good cause.

I do not believe the mind of man could have fashioned any two prohibitions more certainly destined to keep down the

possibility of our being forced into declaring war in the present world crisis.

That part of the public opposing the bill surely cannot understand these two component features of it. They have been the subject of propaganda solely on the feature of the bill repealing the arms embargo, and now let me discuss that for a moment.

I am sincere in my conviction that the failure of Congress at the last session to repeal the arms embargo was a contributing factor to Hitler's brutal and destructive march on Poland. He had been preparing for war steadily for 10 years or more. He had purchased some munitions from us. He knew that from Russia, Hungary, Rumania, from Italy, Finland, Holland, and Belgium he could buy in times of war other war material as he needed it. He had taken over entirely the armed establishment of what had been Austria and Czechoslovakia, and with our failure to repeal the arms embargo he knew that England and France, largely unprepared, especially the former, in their pursuit of peace and happiness in the years past, not looking for and not wanting war, could not purchase a single defensive gun, a single defensive round of ammunition, a single defensive airplane from us—and so he struck. I may be wrong, of course, but I believe as surely as I stand here that had we listened to the President and the Secretary of State at the last session and repealed this measure, proud Poland would be free today and Warsaw would not be in shambles.

From a legal standpoint, the embargo cannot be defended. Not only is it contrary to the custom and usage of this country for 150 years, condemned by statesmen and leaders from Alexander Hamilton to Theodore Roosevelt, but it is not sanctioned by international law.

The Hague Convention, at the conference of 1907, in which England, France, Germany, and America, with dozens of other nations participated, resolved thus on this subject:

A neutral power is not called upon to prevent the export or transport on behalf of one or other of the belligerents, of arms, munitions of war, or in general of anything which may be of use to any army or fleet.

That is a treaty that all nations participating in the conference signed and solemnly declared it to be the law of the nations. Why are we now called on to revise it, especially when such revision is against the interests of the nations that have our sympathy and in favor of the nation whose government and present rulers we despise, condemn, and abhor?

The works of John Bassett Moore are recognized as the leading and outstanding authorities on international law. He was, as you know, once our Assistant Secretary of State, our observer at the World Court, and among other places of distinction that he filled, strangely enough, was that of the Hamilton Fish professorship of international law and diplomacy at Columbia University, as reference to the flyleaf in any of his books will show. That was a chair and professorship endowed, doubtless, by the illustrious father of our present distinguished colleague from New York by the same name and a member of our committee.

Judge Moore has this to say on the subject:

If the sale of munitions of war is to be held a breach of neutrality "instantly upon the declaration of war between the two belligerents, not only the traffic by sea of all the rest of the neutral powers of the world would be exposed to the inconveniences of which they are already impatient, but the whole inland trade of every nation of the earth which has hitherto been free will be cast into fetters. \* \* \* It would give to the belligerent the right of interference of every act of neutral domestic commerce till at last the burden would be so enormous that neutrality itself would become more intolerable than war and the result of this assumed reform professing to be founded on the principles of eternal justice would be nothing less than universal and interminable hostilities."

For not only the vendor of the iron would have to be prevented from selling to the vendor of the gun, but the miner and machinist would have to be prevented from working for the vendor of the iron. A neutral sovereign would therefore either have to stop all machinery by which munitions of war could be produced for belligerent use or expose himself to a call for whatever damages his failure to do so might have caused either belligerent. Under such circumstances it would be far more economical and polite to plunge into war as a belligerent than to keep out of it as a neutral.

Another eminent authority, Charles Noble Gregory, has this to say upon the subject:

Such a change of law and practice . . . magnifies the power of the prepared and predatory states, and it hinders and prevents the defense of the pacific states. It helps the carnivorous states, and it hurts the herbivorous states, as it were. It sharpens the fangs of the wolf, constantly used in attack, and it takes away the antlers of the stag, as constantly used for defense alone. It tends to embroil the nations and to destroy their balance and repose. It is a pernicious, unwise, and immoral restraint, an injurious change in a just rule.

It is submitted that our people have a right by all laws, international and municipal, to manufacture and freely sell to all comers munitions of war (except when restrained for special circumstances by special laws, as along our southern border); that this right is founded not merely on the long-established customs of all nations, including our own, on the opinions of statesmen, judges, and scholars and on the express agreement of the nations at the last Hague Conference, but it rests upon considerations of wise and necessary policy, salutary for all peaceful nations and hostile to predatory nations; that it ought, therefore, to be fully preserved and fully exercised for the welfare and safety of all nations seeking to avoid the extremes of militarism, and to devote themselves, without sacrifice of security, to pursuits of peace; that in adhering to, maintaining, and exercising such a right we pursue a policy hostile to no nation and vital to the safety of our own.

Another well-recognized authority, Prof. John Westlake, sets the proposition out in this language:

Wars now are sudden as conflagrations in their origin and the advantages of preparation and initiative are immense. Why make them vastly greater? Why tempt to secret preparation and sudden aggression by greatly reducing the resources and avails of the defending power? Why aid the wolf and hamstring the lamb? Why, by a change of law and policy, aid and encourage the predatory policy and debilitate defense? Such change must stimulate war and discourage peace.

It is therefore opposed to the general interest of mankind and the present rule is wiser and more pacific, tending to maintain the safety and stability of the nations whose main employments are in the peaceful arts.

I have had on my desk in the past week all the books on international law available at the Library of Congress, and I have found that principle challenged in none of them.

But the argument is advanced that everything else aside to change our law after the war has started would be an unneutral act. In the first place no foreign nation, at war or at peace, can complain about any domestic law that we pass or repeal in peacetime or in wartime. No nation obtained any vested rights by our passage of the present arms embargo. In passing that law we made no contract with them. The legislation was a law governing our own citizens, not a treaty with the nations of the world. In repealing the arms embargo we are not taking sides to any greater extent than we are taking sides now. We are simply saying, by repeal, to all the nations of the world, come and get whatever we have to sell and whatever you can buy, pay for, and carry away. If England and France can come to better advantage, that is no concern of ours. We did not build their navies nor prevent Germany from having a navy equally effective. If it operates to the advantage of France and England to repeal the embargo and permit them to buy munitions here, Germany cannot complain for she already has access by land to purchase arms of a dozen other neutral countries within the sphere of her influence—access to which is denied the Allies. But at the last and in the end, granting that the repeal does help England and France and hurt Germany, I, for one, say "Thank God it does." In the end these democracies in their fight are protecting us. But for the French Army to restrain Hitler at the Maginot line and the English Navy to restrain him on the seas, can any man doubt that we might, indeed, be dragged into war and a defensive war at that? Lifting of the embargo is the best insurance on earth that we can take out for our own peace and security. The sale of arms will not drag us into war. In the World War dozens of nations sold munitions to the belligerents and remained neutral. In the last 2 years we have sold munitions to Japan and China and have not been dragged into their quarrel.

The only agency that can ever put us into war is this Congress by its vote, and as long as this body maintains its equilibrium no war can come.

LXXXV—31

The people of America honestly opposing the lifting of the arms embargo base their opposition largely, I think, upon the theory that it is inhuman, in time of war, to sell to any nation arms for the destruction of human life. That idea is not sound. Sometimes it may be the humane thing to do. In the language of one of the authorities that I quoted, is it humane to sharpen the fangs of the wolf before the attack and then deny succor to the lamb in which he sinks his teeth? Germany bought munitions from us in time of peace. We knew for what use every purchase was destined. Is it proper to sell to a nation to enable it to prepare for war and reprehensible to sell to an unprepared country when attacked?

Furthermore, we can sell to the warring nations everything on earth that goes into the manufacture of munitions. We can sell cotton, zinc, lead, brass, manganese, copper, steel—everything necessary for war purposes, and all the warring nations need do is to buy it and when they get it home, process and assemble the component parts. I cannot for the life of me see the difference between selling wood for the stock of a rifle and steel for the barrel and selling the gun complete, or brass for the base and lead for the point and cotton to make the powder, and the cartridge complete. The only difference is that we lose the value of the processing and manufacture. We have 10,000,000 unemployed, but with the lifting of the embargo I believe that industry would absorb the most of them. Shall we tell them to just sit around and starve, or go on relief—that we are too good to make airplanes and guns and cartridges and shells, but we are hypocritical enough to sell everything necessary for their manufacture abroad?

And let me make this suggestion: To repeal the embargo and permit our industries to continue the manufacture of airplanes, guns, and ammunition, but geared to a high production basis, would be a great step forward in our national defense. Should an emergency arise for us, there is the whole organization, experienced, efficient, and ready to fill the needs of our Government to the full limit of the demand.

This Nation is as unprepared for war today, proportionately speaking, as it was in 1917. Should we be forced into war, it would take us now, as it did then, a solid year of feverish activity by day and night, entailing the waste of billions, before an American Army would be in shape to strike a single effective blow against a well-equipped adversary. To have a far-flung system of industry geared to mass production of munitions would be a long step toward real preparation.

In conclusion, there is one argument advanced by the isolationists of this day that makes me wince when I hear it. Invariably they refer to our participation in the last war. They mention the hundred thousand dead, the billions lost in treasure, and they say America and the world gained nothing from our participation in the conflict. I will concede that to be true. I will go them a measure better and say that we should never have entered the World War. But once in the war, and the dead having died, and the billions having vanished, who is responsible that no good resulted from our sacrifices? The fault lies with the isolationists and the partisans in Congress of that day. Had the peace of 1918 been followed, as President Wilson urged, by a strong, representative League of Nations and a World Court, with America lending her great weight and prestige, I maintain that the dozen wars fought since would have been settled about the council table before issue was taken on the battlefield.

I was on detached service in Paris during the Peace Conference and had occasion to see President Wilson as he moved from group to group assembled there, his face shining with the high ideal and noble purpose of writing the sacrifice of our dead into a covenant that would bring a new era of peace. And then I saw him a few months later in Washington, when the fruits of victory had been snatched away by the isolationists and the partisans of the day, and a pitiable spectacle of a man he was, that, broken with the realization



that his dead had died in vain, walked with shuffling step and drooping mouth toward his grave.

I am no internationalist and I know that the League and World Court are dead issues never to be revived, but when the opponents of this measure, the isolationists and partisans, seek to buttress their argument with the fact that we gained nothing from the last war, I remember why we did not gain anything and discredit that argument accordingly.

The stand that America should take today is to say to the warring nations, "Your war is not ours, we will have none of it, but in accordance with our custom and usage for 150 years, in accordance with our national dignity and the law of nations, recognized since time out of mind, we are ready to sell to all of you whatever you can buy, pay for, and transport." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. BEAM]. Under special order heretofore made, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. Hook] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### FINLAND AND THE UNITED STATES

Mr. HOOK. Mr. Speaker, if I may be permitted the indulgence of the House, I shall quote a very short speech which I delivered at the Finland day celebration at the world's fair on June 24 last:

Mr. Commissioner General. Your Excellency, the Minister from Finland, and all others of high rank participating in this Finland day celebration at the world's fair in New York. As a Member of the Congress of the United States of America, one of the greatest deliberative bodies in the world, I have perceived with satisfaction and extreme pleasure that the two great democracies of Finland and the United States are striving toward the same goal of social justice coupled with liberty under the law. The emblems of these two countries, more than any other, float in the breeze side by side having been conceived on common ground.

The principles of democracy and freedom so dear to the hearts of the people of Finland and the United States of America have their roots in religion. God is our master. Through Christian spirit, with the help of Almighty God, we have established the greatest form of government known to man. Freedom of press, freedom of speech, and the right to worship God according to the dictates of our own conscience, is ours. These we now have and shall keep in Finland and the United States of America just so long as we pledge ourselves that God in His divine mercy will be our guiding light. The whole world is in a turmoil. We hear a cry for neutrality. Neutrality is a state of mind. It cannot be legislated but can be brought about only through the practice of Christian principles and friendship such as is enjoyed between the peoples of the United States of America and Finland.

Although the Finnish language is so very different from ours there are so many other common interests and ties between the two peoples that this has never been a barrier between us. Those of us in America who are familiar with the innumerable fine qualities of the Finns, those of us who have lived among them in America and who are acquainted with the many great contributions they have made to the cultural and public life of our country are proud to point to Finland as the country in Europe where the humanitarian and intellectual principles of liberty and justice are working in reality.

I am grateful for this opportunity to again express my friendship and feelings toward Finland. It is my sincere prayer to Almighty God that the friendly spirit which prevails in both nations last through the ages and that democracy in its unalloyed supremacy shall be ours forever. We are at peace with the world and at peace we shall remain.

It is not my intention, this afternoon, to discuss the technicalities of the neutrality bill as it has been presented to the Senate of the United States or to, in any way, comment upon any of the arguments raised by either side in this most important debate. I need not review the events leading up to the present crisis because that has been covered more eloquently and forcefully than I could hope to do in the few minutes allotted to me this afternoon. I must, however, reiterate that I am still of the opinion that neutrality is a question of policy, not legislation. It is a state of mind. In order to remain neutral we must remain friendly to all nations. We may lay down the rules of what may or may not be done during a conflict between belligerent nations but in the final analysis the people themselves, in their hearts and minds, determine the policy of neutrality; yes, they determine the policy of this or any other nation. The Congress and the administration officials are bound together under one solemn promise—that we shall do everything humanly possible to remain out of any foreign conflict, free from foreign entanglements. It is my most ardent hope that we will strengthen

our neutrality policy to the point where we will be safely neutral, to the extent that we will definitely and positively keep out of this war. We must not allow the ideologies of the imperialistic groups in Europe to, in any way, become implanted on this continent. War is a horrible thing, and having worn a uniform in the last war, I will do everything in my power to see that we keep completely out of this war. We should realize our mistakes in the last conflict and act accordingly. There seems to be a division of thought as to how we are to remain neutral. I believe that both schools of thought have one thing in mind, and that is that we keep out of war. If we keep paramount in our minds the fact that we must remain neutral, I feel certain that it can and will be done. As I have stated, neutrality, after all, is a matter of policy which must be set up so that we may meet the changing conditions of the world, because what may be a neutral act today may be an overt act tomorrow. What may be neutral zones on the high seas today may be war zones tomorrow. Therefore, we should not do anything that, in a mandatory way, would stifle and tie the hands of those who hold the responsibility of keeping this Nation neutral and at peace. I may question the judgment of some, and they may question mine but, nevertheless, I cannot question their patriotism or their sincerity to remain neutral and at peace.

From 1914 to 1918 a World War was fought, supposedly, to keep the world safe for democracy. Democracy is a form of government developed in the hearts and the minds of men and women working in the best interests of all the people. During the horrible conflict that was waged in the last war, when men and women on both sides of the Atlantic fought and died on the battlefields, certain nations in Europe remained neutral and at peace. Those nations are traditionally neutral and they can be. They have demonstrated their love of peace. They are the Scandinavian countries in and around the Baltic. The United States of America stretches out a friendly gesture to all nations, and it is the ardent prayer in the heart of every American citizen that peace shall soon be a reality in the world. The United States always has had friendly relations with Russia, both diplomatically and commercially. We ardently hope that that friendship will remain. Out of the conflict of the World War came the fact that many nations became indebted to the United States of America. Among those was the newly founded Republic of Finland and, of all nations, that nation has kept her contractual obligations, and has paid her debts on time.

Finland is the neighbor of Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and Russia. Thus geographically she forms the border between east and west. Finland has through the ages contributed to the benefits of civilization. She has always turned her gaze toward the west and the south. The Baltic Sea has linked her to the outer world, and, although Finland was connected with Russia for over 100 years as an autonomous grand duchy, she never lost her western traits or her national traditions. The United States and Finland have much in common. They are lovers of independence, freedom, and democracy; lovers of peace and progress. Upon the achievement of national independence, Finland drew up a free constitution for herself, and it was democratic United States that provided the model that the legislators followed in many respects. In fact, the relation of the United States and Finland dates back many years even to the extent of blood relationship stretching back for hundreds of years. The swift development of Finland in industry and government has earned the admiration of the rest of the world. Democratic friendship and democratic spirit, as I have stated before, is born in the hearts and the minds of the people. That spirit knows no distance; space is no obstacle. A friendly tie exists and a friendship for Finland has rested in the hearts and the minds of every free-thinking, liberty-loving person in the United States. It is our ardent hope that these liberty-loving, peace-loving people be allowed to live and enjoy life without any interference of any imperialistic government.

It may be well at this time to relate a little of the historical and geographical background which has led up to the present situation in the Baltic. As I stated before, Sweden, Norway, and Denmark have enjoyed the friendship of all nations and

commerce with all nations because of freedom of the Baltic. Finland has always enjoyed these privileges. Like a row of stepping stones from Sweden to Finland across the Gulf of Bothnia, the Aaland Islands occupy a key position. They command both the entrance of the Gulf of Finland, Russia's only ice-free outlet to western Europe, and also the route to the northern Swedish iron mines and Finland's aluminum works. These Aaland Islands after the World War were claimed by Sweden and Finland and were awarded to Finland in 1920 by the League of Nations. In 1921 an international convention decreed the perpetual neutralization and demilitarization of the islands. The signatories to this were Britain, France, Italy, and all the states around the Baltic except Russia. Last year Finland opened negotiations with Sweden to arrange a partial refortification of the islands as a measure of their mutual protection and as a part of a plan to safeguard the independence of the north. Agreement was reached in January, and the two countries then sought permission of the signatories of the 1921 convention to carry it into effect. The last of the signatories to reply was Germany, who in May gave consent but added:

The neutrality of Finland and Sweden in the case of any warlike development affecting the Baltic is a self-evident condition.

It is of factual interest today for all American citizens to observe and evaluate the recent discussions between Finland and Russia. It is of extreme importance that the position of the United States and the feelings and sentiments of our people be fully and completely understood by the world at large.

We can discuss neutrality here on the floor of this House—our people can study and debate the problem day after day—and still one vital factor will never be reached in the debates. This factor, to my mind, is the emotional reaction of our people to any aggressive actions made by any imperialistic power against that sturdy little democracy—Finland.

Our relations with Russia, even though we do not believe in her philosophy of government, have been and, I hope, will continue to be most friendly and cordial. I know that it is the sincere desire of our country to maintain this friendly relationship. I hope that nothing will occur in the Baltic which will in any way so affect the feelings of our people that will damage this relationship. Russia surely knows that any overt act toward Finland will not be pleasant to the American people.

We, more than any people on earth, know and love democracy. We have in our Government processes developed the highest degree of freedom of thought and action for the individual, a government which manifests in its every action the will of its people. These things have been said time and again far more eloquently than I could hope to express them. They cannot, however, be called to mind too often.

It is difficult to present calmly a definite and reassuring formula of American public opinion. We are painfully aware of the rapid changes in public moods and sentiments. At this time every single American is striving to follow the developments in Europe with studied calmness and without undue alarm. So far it has been a magnificent demonstration of the capabilities of our democracy. We know that America's historic contribution to political thought and practice is in our ability to maintain and safeguard the fundamental rights of individuals.

It is only natural that our sympathies lie with countries whose political ideals and thinking is close to our own. It is only natural that we should and do admire those thoughts and practices when they are manifested in other countries.

I am wondering if Russia is completely aware of the strong attachment the people of America feel and have felt toward Finland. We cannot legislate feeling and emotion out of the hearts of Americans. Nor do I for a moment think that any Member of this House believes that we can. The strong feeling of friendship that exists between the United States and Finland should be well recognized throughout the world. This friendship should not be taken too lightly by imperialistic nations bent on extending their power over a smaller neighbor.

There is no doubt of the sincerity on the part of the Baltic states to remain neutral and friendly throughout any conflict. That has been admirably demonstrated.

I might further state that Finland has developed a social-welfare program that is the envy of many people of the world. They fully realize that only in peacetime can they continue to develop the home and the farm that is the backbone of this wonderful little country.

It is rather a phenomenal thing that the American people should in such a short time develop a feeling and friendship toward Finland to such an extent that any interference with her liberty might arouse the emotions of the American people to such an extent that it might endanger our friendship with nations that we sincerely hope to remain friendly with. It is the sincere desire and hope of the people of the United States of America that the Baltic situation may be amicably settled to the satisfaction of all concerned so that Sweden, Norway, Finland, and all others desiring peace may be free to carry on in the interest of humanity and justice as they have in the past. It is our sincere hope that Russia will not do anything that will impair the friendship that exists between the Baltic states, and especially Finland, with the United States. I am especially proud of the fact that the responsible officials of the United States have conveyed to Russia our friendly feelings to our friendly neighbor, the Republic of Finland. Let us hope that Russia will respect the wishes of the Western Hemisphere that Finland be allowed to remain at peace so that a free people may continue in its struggle for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

#### LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of the other addresses today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Friday next, after the reading of the Journal and the conclusion of the legislative program for the day, I be permitted to address the House for 20 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman expect to use the time allotted to him today?

Mr. HOFFMAN. No.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent to proceed for 20 minutes on Friday next. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

#### A COUNTRY SICK OF STRIKES

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, with the permission of the House, I shall read an article taken from the Philadelphia Inquirer of Sunday, October 15, 1939, entitled "A Country Sick of Strikes."

#### A COUNTRY SICK OF STRIKES

How much longer must this country continue to endure constant turmoil in industry, retarding prosperity and throwing numberless skilled workers out of jobs?

How much longer, at a time when 10,000,000 men and women, hungry for work, can't find it, are additional thousands and hundreds of thousands to be denied employment through unnecessary strikes?

How much longer must a large segment of American industry and American workmen continue to live and succeed only by grace of the C. I. O. and John L. Lewis, imperious labor czar, who, among other distinctions, has the questionable honor of fathering that ugly brace of illegitimate union weapons, the sit-down and the slow-down strikes?

We don't know. But we do know that the American people are sick and tired of it all. We believe that to a constantly increasing extent public sympathy with strikes, touched off here, there, and everywhere by unscrupulous labor leaders with the bland unconcern of a man ordering a sandwich, is being alienated.



The right to strike is basic and unquestioned. Men forced to toll excessive hours for inadequate pay or made to suffer under intolerable working conditions have an indubitable right to stop work until their reasonable demands are met.

There are strikes that are wholly justifiable. There are employers with whom no other form of argument is effective. But of the 2,772 strikes in the United States last year, involving 688,000 workers and resulting in 9,000,000 man-days of idleness, a large proportion appeared to be totally unwarranted and unnecessary.

When the strike is used as a knotted club to enforce demands that are not reasonable, when it is employed with scant discrimination by power-fattened union bosses seeking not only to tighten their grip on the workers they so crudely misrepresent but to extend their stifling control over industry as well, then the strike becomes something more than a nuisance—it is a definite menace to the peace and security of the country.

Latest of major industrial conflicts is that which has thrown 40,000 men out of work in the Chrysler automobile plants and 15,000 more in the body plants of the Briggs Co. On the eve of negotiations for a new contract with the Chrysler Corporation, C. I. O. workers adopted a new form of sabotage—for it was nothing less—called the slow-down.

Every second unit on the assembly line went past them untouched, causing a 50-percent cut in production. Their excuse was that production had been speeded up unduly. The company, denying the charge, closed the plants, and the union later filed a formal 5-day notice of a strike, a procedure compulsory under Michigan law.

According to union spokesmen, the notification set forth a demand that the union shall have a voice hereafter in the framing of promotion schedules.

Is that a reasonable demand?

We hold no brief for the Chrysler Corporation, but regardless of the merits of the present situation there will be general agreement that its president, K. T. Keller, is justified in this statement: "You cannot run a business on a sound basis and produce quality automobiles if men tell their foremen what they will do and what they will not do. You cannot permit them to take into their own hands the running of the plants."

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In the strike in the Chrysler plant to which the article refers, where 55,000 men are out of work, one of the demands is that the union, through Mr. Frankenstein, control the limited production.

Mr. RICH. That is what this news article states. It states that it is contrary to all common sense; it is to the detriment of labor and to the detriment of the plant and the detriment of the public generally.

Mr. HOFFMAN. And the wage there is 40 percent higher than the average wage in the United States in all industrial work.

Mr. RICH. I quite agree. I shall continue with the article:

Grant the union's contention that John Lewis or any insolent labor tycoon has the right to impose upon producers his take-it-or-leave-it decrees in any matters relating not to labor but to management, and you have a fine candid-camera picture of the camel's head slipping under the tent.

What is it all leading to? We know what the vicious sit-down strike did to industry and to the peace and order of the country. Is the slow-down the forerunner of another wave of industrial disorder, with the purpose back of it to dictate, starting with production schedules, every detail of management?

As buying capacity increases, and the demand for new goods is stepped up, and we see some slight chance to dig ourselves out of the quicksands of depression, is production to be impeded, or halted altogether, by demands no business can accede to and continue to live?

At a time when we are making heroic efforts to build up the Nation's defenses, against the possibility of aggression directed against us in a world on fire, will Army and Navy orders for essential mechanical equipment be held up by strikes—slow-down, sit-down, or what have you?

Are we to be given the Hobson's choice of letting labor dictators like John Lewis take over American industry with an iron hand, rule and ruin it, or experience another campaign of destruction, rioting, and bloodshed like the one that brought large sections of this country to the verge of anarchy in the summer of 1937?

Perhaps not. We devoutly hope not. But let those of short memories be reminded that even in our own State of Pennsylvania, just 2 short years ago, the C. I. O. strong-arm tactics in the Johnstown steel-mills strike were such that property was wantonly damaged and human lives placed in jeopardy, while a Democratic State administration, subservient to John L. Lewis, first stood by complacently and then closed the mills, so that men willing to work couldn't work.

What hope is there today for a return to peace in industry? Can nothing be done to improve a situation fraught with danger to the best interests of labor as well as industry?

One step that could not fail to provide a sounder basis for industrial relations would be the drastic amendment, or, better still, the complete rewriting, of the Wagner Labor Act.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICH. Yes; provided I can get a couple of minutes more time to finish this article?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Pennsylvania be permitted to have an additional 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore [Mr. FRIES]. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Has the gentleman seen this dispatch under date of October 12, the Associated Press, from San Francisco, to the effect that the C. I. O. shouts condemnation of the Labor Board? Does the gentleman know that John Lewis is against the Labor Board?

Mr. RICH. I think the C. I. O. is just camouflaging the issue, because the Labor Board seems to be working pretty well with the C. I. O. They have gotten everything from them that anybody could desire, right and wrong alike. I think that is only camouflage or a smoke screen.

Mr. HOFFMAN. This resolution from the C. I. O. international convention at San Francisco says that the C. I. O. brands the adoption of such policies and such displacement of personnel as unwarranted and an unworthy retreat by the Board.

Mr. RICH. I would say to the gentleman that anything the C. I. O. stands for I am against. For it will ultimately ruin labor, business, and the country. They have too many Communists in their midst in responsible positions.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Oh, the gentleman surely does not mean that.

Mr. RICH. The C. I. O. stands for the wrecking of the American form of government. I think it would do anything to make this a communistic Nation, and anyone who is for making this anything but a constitutional form of government I am against—I don't care whether he sits in the White House or anywhere else. I am for constitutional government—freedom of press, freedom of radio, freedom of speech, and religious freedom.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Does the gentleman make a distinction between what the C. I. O. says and what it wants or does?

Mr. RICH. I have no confidence in the C. I. O. or anything that it stands for. I say to the Congress that we should not wait until January 3 next to start legislation to revise the Wagner Act and get a new labor law. The editorial continues:

Purporting to be an instrument whose purposes is "to remove the causes of industrial disputes" it is directly responsible for fomenting disputes and encouraging the calling of superfluous strikes.

The Labor Board, set up under the provisions of this act, is judge, jury, and prosecutor. Prosecutor of whom? Of the employer and only the employer every time.

The oft-reiterated charge that the Board as constituted is arbitrary and unfair in its rulings has received abundant support in numberless cases. But no Board could administer real justice while operating under the Wagner Labor Act, because that law is grossly unfair, one-sided, and discriminatory.

We have said it before and we repeat now that there will be no enduring peace in American industry until we have a new labor law and a new labor board.

If Congress fails to meet this situation at the beginning of its next regular session, it will not only be derelict in the performance of a paramount duty, but it will have to bear the responsibility for a continuance of industrial conditions which have become utterly intolerable.

Sooner or later these questions will have to be answered and answered right:

Is the industrial structure of the United States, upon which the life and prosperity of the country are dependent, to be placed completely under the dominion of a handful of self-constituted overlords of labor, to do with as they like at the point of a gun?

Or are the people, through their representatives in Government, going to enact a sound law covering industrial relations—and enforce it?

That is the vital question. Let me read that again. As the majority leader is in the hall listening, I want him to

act, and act now, and not do as stated at the last session of Congress, "There will be no labor legislation at this session." I hope that the fine gentleman, one of the men whom we all like and honor and love, will see that it is necessary that we change the law, because we all like SAM RAYBURN. [Applause.] We know that he is a man who will do things if we can only start him. [Laughter.] We are hoping that he will start this legislation.

Now, let me repeat this: "Or are people, through their representatives in government, going to enact a sound law covering industrial relations, and enforce it?"

That is the question the people of America want to have answered. That is the question I hope this Congress will answer for the American people, so that we can have an enduring peace between capital and labor, between the workmen and the employers; because, after all is said and done, you cannot have continued strikes in industry and expect industry to succeed. Industry is sick. Industry has just about reached the point where it is giving up. When it quits creating jobs, then what? It is a serious situation. Yesterday I talked to a man who has been in the coal business all his life in the anthracite coal fields. He said that practically every operator in the coal field will be compelled to shut down in the not very far distant future. He made this statement: That all private operators in the coal business have practically gotten out, or have been forced to quit because of labor wars and the 7-hour day, and the only operators that are continuing today are those that are being continued by the bankers, because of the fact that the bankers have loaned money to those coal companies and they are either compelled to operate them or lose all that they have loaned to these corporations; and they may lose all and the miners all lose their jobs.

Now, the question is serious. Are we going to give labor a fair deal, also, at the same time, are we going to give industry a fair deal, and are we going to give the American people a fair deal? That is the question the people of this country want Congress to answer, and I hope we will answer it in a short time before it is too late. And there is no time to lose. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

The SPEAKER. Under special order of the House, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. LUDLOW] is recognized for 15 minutes.

#### NEUTRALITY LEGISLATION—THE CLASH OF IDEOLOGIES IN AMERICA

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, in this country of ours we have two ideologies in respect to war. Those ideologies have come to the point where they are clashing violently and where America must choose between them. If we adopt as our permanent policy one ideology, sometimes contemptuously referred to as "isolation," but which is not isolation at all, we may safely count on remaining at peace with the world. If we adopt as our policy the other ideology, the interventionist ideology, it will simply be a question of time when it will drag us into war.

I have said that isolation is a misnomer, and it is. The isolation ideology does not suggest or even intimate that America should isolate itself from the world. It merely suggests that we should isolate ourselves from the wars that are eternally brewing in the cockpit of Europe and in other foreign trouble areas of the globe. This we are fortunately able to do because of our detached geographical position.

A nation is no more to blame for isolating itself from war than an individual is for isolating himself from a fight when a fight is not necessary. When the G-men shot down the outlaw, John Dillinger, they sent a rain of lead across a public alley in Chicago. The citizens who were looking on had a perfect right to cross that alley, it being a public reservation, but being practical persons, endowed with a reasonable degree of common sense, they did not do so while the revolvers were barking and the lead was pouring. Those citizens did not isolate themselves from the world. They simply isolated themselves from that fight, and very properly and sensibly so.

The founder of the ideology which kept us out of wars for over a century of our national life and that will continue to keep us out of war for all time if we adhere to it, the misnamed isolation ideology, was George Washington.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LUDLOW. I yield.

Mr. PIERCE of Oregon. When was that century that we kept out of war?

Mr. LUDLOW. I mean that it has kept us out of many difficulties we would have gotten into if we had not had that philosophy. As a matter of fact, for more than a century prior to the World War our isolation policy kept us out of wars overseas. Thomas Jefferson was one of the most ardent supporters and defenders of this philosophy.

#### ANOTHER MADMAN IN EUROPE

When Washington and Jefferson were living, conditions in the Old World were not far different from conditions today. A madman was loose in Europe, even more ruthless than Hitler. His name was Napoleon. He will go down in history for his fiendish cruelties, for the misery he caused, for the homes he desolated, for the widows and orphans he made. Under his malevolent sway ancient boundaries crumbled and age-old dynasties crashed like houses of cards. Did Washington and Jefferson advocate American intervention to suppress Napoleon? Not at all. The bug of internationalism had never bitten them. Unlike our modern internationalists they had a very firm conviction that Europe's affairs were none of our business. Jefferson, who had been Minister to France, was very bitter toward Napoleon and wrote many letters denouncing him, referring to him as a "butcher." But Washington and Jefferson thanked God for the wide ocean lying between America and Europe and wisely insisted that America should leave Europe and its affairs severely alone. Napoleon was more brutal than Hitler, but Jefferson did not believe that we should try to wipe out the sins of Napoleon with the blood of American boys. It was the firm and settled conviction of Jefferson and all of the other founding fathers that we should keep out of the whole European mess, then and forevermore. And that, I believe, is good sense today, just as it was good sense 125 years ago.

Said Washington in his Farewell Address, delivered on September 17, 1796:

Europe has a set of primary interests which to us have none or a very remote relation. Hence she must be engaged in frequent controversies, the causes of which are essentially foreign to our concerns. Hence, therefore, it must be unwise in us to implicate ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics or the ordinary combinations and collisions of her friendships or enmities.

And then, to stress how geography happily contributes to help America to maintain perpetual peace and to keep out of foreign broils, he added this striking admonition:

Why forego the advantages of so peculiar a situation? Why quit our own to stand upon foreign ground? Why, by interweaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalry, interest, humor, or caprice?

#### JEFFERSON'S FAR-SEEING VISION

Remarkably similar to Washington's warning against foreign entanglements was the advice given by Jefferson in his third annual message to Congress when he said:

Separated by a wide ocean from the nations of Europe and from the political interests which entangle them together; with productions and wants which render our commerce and friendship useful to them and theirs to us, it cannot be the interest of any to assail us, nor ours to disturb them. We should be most unwise, indeed, were we to cast away the singular blessings of the position in which Nature has placed us, the opportunity she has endowed us with of pursuing at a distance from foreign contentions the paths of industry, peace, and happiness; of cultivating general friendship, and of bringing collisions of interests to the umpirage of reason rather than of force.

If we could think of Jefferson as being gifted with divine prescience, we might imagine he was thinking of present world conditions when he wrote:

But for us to attempt by war to reform all Europe and bring them back to principles of morality and a respect for the equal rights of nations would show us to be only maniacs of another character.



The clash between the Washington-Jefferson ideology which holds that America's supreme destiny lies in attending to our own business, keeping out of foreign quarrels, and building up our moral and economic strength at home, and the modern internationalist ideology which teaches that it is America's duty to help to police the world and to join with certain powers against other powers for world dominion, went through a climactic period during the consideration of the neutrality legislation at the last session of Congress and the followers of Washington and Jefferson won that important round of the battle when the amendment was adopted placing a mandatory embargo on the shipment of munitions to belligerents. In every Congress of recent years I have introduced a neutrality resolution which would go further than a mere embargo on munitions and would embargo the shipment of all articles, whether munitions or not, to belligerents. True neutrality would require that all supplies be cut off, inasmuch as many articles—food, for instance—are quite as essential to fighting a war as guns, bombing planes, and ammunition, but while Congress has not looked with favor on a general embargo, a long step in upholding the Washington ideology was taken at the recent session when munitions were embargoed.

The Bloom so-called neutrality bill, now under debate in the Senate, runs counter to the general wish of our people that America should keep out of war. It is a shining example of the interventionist ideology. It is based on the theory that it is to the best interest of the United States to line up on the side of certain great powers and against certain other great powers. It would plunge America into power politics up to the hilt. No candid champion of the bill, however ardently he might favor it, ever claimed that it is a neutrality bill. Its proponents frankly admit that it is a bill in the interest of England and France, and its effect would be to make America an ally of the British Empire and France in any future war in which they choose to engage, because it would establish the United States as the arsenal and storehouse of supplies and credits for those countries that control the seas.

From the standpoint of creating a war risk, what could be worse for America? With a superlatively profitable war trade once established, the American interests that are the beneficiaries of the flow of wealth would pull with the strength of a million hawsers to bring America into the war on the side of their commercial allies to protect that trade. We can never keep out of war if we have an enormous stake in the game. Our stake must be in peace and not in war, if we are to remain safe and secure. Britain and France, commanding the seas and assisted by short-term credits, would be in a position to draw on the vast resources of America to wage their wars if the Bloom bill passes. If that bill is enacted and the embargo amendment is repealed, we may look forward to the next step, the placing of our armies at the disposal of Britain and France, for that is what it will amount to in the end anyway. I loathe the dictators for their suppression of liberty and their unconscionable crimes against humanity, and I would like to see every dictatorship on earth abolished, but God did not give America a commission to regulate the world, and if great masses of people prefer to live under a rule of totalitarian absolutism rather than under a form of government which would confer the blessings of freedom upon them and their posterity, what right have we to deny them their choice? We pity them but we cannot control that situation.

#### EFFORTS OF FOREIGNERS TO DICTATE OUR POLICY

I am heartsick over the attempts of foreign governments to dictate the foreign policy of the United States, and I am still more heartsick over the cooperation they are receiving from some of our American statesmen. This is true as to other foreign policies as well as neutrality. The Manchester Guardian, which many regard as England's leading newspaper, not even excepting the "Thunderer," of London, on July 29 last published the following special from New York:

London dispatches published in the American newspapers today suggest that there is some regret among British Government officials about the manner and the time of the United States' denunciation of her treaty with Japan. The point made is that it is unfortunate that Great Britain was not notified in advance. It is suggested that if Britain had possessed foreknowledge of the American plans, the

recent Anglo-Japanese agreement would have been of a different character. The best available evidence is that it would have been impossible to notify the British sooner because the American action was not planned in advance.

Here we have an intimation printed in a leading British newspaper, which ought to give it credence, that British Government officials were put out because the United States did not submit an important trade policy to be visaged by the British in London before it was promulgated in Washington! If these favored nations are able to influence our foreign policy, their next step may be to seek to influence our trade and commercial policy, as Britain seemed bent on accomplishing in this instance, presumably to make our trade and commercial relations with other nations conform to our new role as world policeman. If that happens, what becomes of our boasted independence? I verily believe that Washington and Jefferson would turn over in their graves if they could see how these foreign influences are reaching out to shape our foreign policy to their advantage and to the disadvantage of rival foreign nations. Yielding to these influences saps and weakens our national prestige and makes us in effect just one more combatant in a world of strife, subject to all of the hazard of a combatant's role. We should have just one policy and stick to it and that policy is "America for Americans." I will venture to say that the nations that are trying to use us by inducing us to line up in an alliance with them in both a military and commercial way would not think for a moment of accommodating us in a similar manner if the shoe were on the other foot.

#### HOW MUCH BETTER AMERICA IS, IF WE ONLY KNEW IT

I wish that every internationalist in the United States who imagines that it is our duty to abandon Washington's cherished policy of isolation and immunity to become a world policeman could take sabbatical leave for 1 year to study conditions in foreign countries. I would like for him to contrast the high wages paid to our workingmen, the highest wages paid in the world, with the pauper wages of other countries ranging as low as 2 and 3 cents an hour in one country I visited recently. I would like for him to contrast living conditions in America where so many people own their homes with the indescribable squalor and poverty seen in so many countries. I would like for him to contrast the freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religious worship, freedom of action which he enjoys in this country with the entire lack of such freedom in other countries, and then I would like to ask him if he wishes to see an international policy installed that will make us a part of these wretched foreign conditions and drag us down to their levels. If we do not watch our step one inevitable fact sooner or later will burn into our minds like a red-hot iron, and that is that all of our misguided good intentions never will reform and uplift power politics, but power politics if given the opportunity will destroy our democracy and drag us down to levels of slavery and degradation that cannot easily be imagined by those who do not realize how the other half of the world lives. If we really appreciate the inestimable blessings of freedom and equality which we enjoy under our priceless Constitution, we will shun power politics as we would a pestilence.

I have no patience with those who for a year or longer have been reiterating with parrotlike repetition that "if another European war breaks out, we cannot keep out of it." Why not? Of course, we can; and if I understand the temper of the American people we will keep out unless some ill-advised action drags us in, contrary to a very set and determined popular opinion. Holland, Denmark, and the Scandinavian countries kept out of the last war and they were right under the big guns. Should it be so very difficult for a nation to keep out that is 3,000 miles from the scene of conflict with a great ocean in between? It was symptomatic of the good judgment of those countries that at the very time the phrase, "We can't keep out of war if it comes," was being bandied recklessly about during the debate on the neutrality bill in the House, the American Minister to Denmark advised our Government that Denmark had notified the contending Euro-

pean nations that if war should come Denmark would be strictly neutral.

One thing certain is that we cannot hope to keep out of the world strife that is boiling in both hemispheres if we allow our citizens to build up a big stake in the war by furnishing ammunition and credits to one set of belligerents and denying the same to another set of belligerents. Aside from the un-Christian aspect of supplying munitions for the destruction of homes and mass killings of human beings, there is always the certainty that we will be pulled into the war to protect our stake.

Now, here are some figures that ought to forever doom such an unneutral proposal: In the 150 years the United States has been functioning as an independent sovereignty, England has been engaged in 54 wars, lasting 102 years, or 68 percent of the time. During the 150 years, France has been engaged in 53 wars, lasting 99 years, or 66 percent of the time. Is it possible that we intend to ally ourselves with these fighting nations by making America the arsenal, storehouse, and source of supplies for them in all of their future wars? And if we do so, how long do you think we will be able to keep out of war? Yet that is exactly what is proposed.

#### THERE IS ALWAYS WAR SOMEWHERE

I have the greatest respect for President Roosevelt. With many fine things he has done to improve our domestic conditions I am in full accord, and I have supported him wholeheartedly in those accomplishments, but I find it difficult to agree with his views so strikingly expressed in an interview he gave on July 4 last. That interview was summarized in the Washington Times-Herald as follows:

The policy of the administration is to try to prevent war in any part of the world, and that is the first policy of the administration, the President declared.

There is never a time when there are not wars in some parts of the world. Wars have been going on since the dawn of creation and the Almighty has not stopped them. Imagine officials at Washington trying to prevent war in any part of the world, and then imagine, if you can, the commitments we would have to make and the vast expenditure of blood and treasure it would be necessary to pour out in order to make such a policy effective. The Almighty created man with the traits of a fighting animal and there will always be wars. If we project ourselves into every foreign affair, we will find ourselves without friends and without influence, used by some nations, hated and despised by all, and sooner or later involved up to our necks in war.

No; it would be much better to cling to Washington's ideology of isolation, protected by our geographical position, than to try to set ourselves up as an arbiter to settle all of the wars in the world. It cannot be too strongly asserted that isolation does not mean isolation from the world but isolation from war and, contrary to Secretary Hull's announced belief, the placing of a complete embargo on exports to belligerents would not be "ruinous to our economic life."

I am sure that Secretary Hull had not given careful consideration to the statistics of exports when he made that statement. No one expects or wishes to shut off exports to all nations. All that is contemplated is a cessation of exports to belligerent nations just as long as they remain belligerents. Yet, according to the last report of the Department of Commerce on foreign trade, the total of our exports to all foreign countries in 1937, the last year for which statistics are available, was only 7.8 percent of our total production of movable goods. This covers our normal exports to all of the world; and if the ban on exports were applied only to two or even three or four belligerents, the loss in our normal foreign trade would be infinitesimal compared with the home market for our goods. I submit that the loss of this small fraction of our foreign business not only would not be ruinous to our economic life but it would be a small concession, indeed, compared with the frightful burden of debt that will be saddled on ourselves and on our children and our children's children if we become involved in another war. One month of war would cost us more than our profits on foreign trade for 20 years.

#### A TRUE NEUTRALITY POLICY

So I think it is quite clear that from the standpoint of our Nation as a whole it is good business as well as good morals—and certainly good policy from the standpoint of noninvolvement—to establish a complete embargo on exports to belligerent nations as long as those nations remain belligerents.

A true neutrality policy in harmony with Washington's ideology and designed to keep America a free and independent nation for all time would embrace at least these four cardinal principles:

First. At the outbreak of war between foreign powers, embargoes to be levied on all goods to belligerents.

Second. No American vessel to be used in trade of any sort with any belligerent or in any zone of danger.

Third. American citizens to be ordered to keep out of all danger zones, and if they disobey it will be at their own risk.

Fourth. No discretion to the President or to anyone else to discriminate between belligerents on a basis of moral judgments—in other words, to name the aggressor.

In a majority of cases, if not all instances, naming the aggressor would be tantamount to putting us in the war.

If I were President I would put a check on all sword-rattling Cabinet ministers and their bellicose subordinates and make them either remain silent or talk the language of peace instead of the language of war. That, I think, would be a contribution to the peace and security of America. We should not live in eternal fear of attack from some foreign power, for if we attend to our own business that is never going to happen. If Hitler hesitated so long about attacking Czechoslovakia and little Danzig, right at his doorstep, is anyone so fatuous as to imagine he is coming 3,000 miles across the ocean to attack us?

#### NO ONE WANTS WAR

If you put the question "Do you want war or peace?" to 100 American citizens, chosen at random, the unhesitating answer in each of the 100 instances probably will be "peace." Nor will you be the least bit surprised by the unanimity of the replies. The surprise and shock would come if some one of the hundred should unexpectedly answer "war." Americans are universally for peace. As a citizen and as a representative of citizens in the Congress of the United States, I am for peace with all my heart and soul. With all the solemnity I can command, my right hand raised to the Father of us all, I declare that unless America is attacked or invaded, unless we are forced into a defensive position to protect our very existence as a nation, I will never vote to send our precious boys into the hell of war. You can count on me for that. And you may be sure that I will not be misled by any fallacious reasoning or false propaganda into accepting as dangerous a situation that may not be dangerous at all as to our own national safety. There are defense wars and there are policy wars, and no internationalists are ever going to cajole or frighten me into believing that it is good policy, in order "to make the world safe for democracy," for us to hurl the flower of our young manhood into the slaughter pens of foreign countries in the settlement of boundary disputes, quarrels between reigning houses, and blood feuds that have been going on a thousand years, and that will be going on a thousand years after we are all dead and gone. I have too much love for our boys to throw their lives away in any such fashion as that.

#### BLESSED ARE THE PEACEMAKERS

Adequate preparedness is not inconsistent with the Washington ideology of an America free and independent, cultivating friendly relations with all nations and entangling alliances with none. I would appropriate every dollar needed to make our defenses as impregnable as possible, as insurance against attacks which I believe will never happen. Having done that, I would rely on the wisdom of Washington and the other founding fathers and the guidance of Him who said "Blessed are the peacemakers" to lead us safely through all of the trials and tribulations of the future.

This is not a political question. The arms embargo which some of us are seeking to retain was almost unanimously adopted by an overwhelmingly Democratic Congress and



approved by our Democratic President a few years ago. It was considered then to be the very best device to keep us out of war. Now the proposal is to abolish it before it ever has had a test. Surely no Democratic Member can be accused of a lack of party fealty if he votes to retain the embargo provision that had practically unanimous Democratic approval such a short time ago in the calm atmosphere that preceded the outbreak of war. The question now naturally arises, Why change it in the midst of a war? The answer is, To make America the arsenal and supply house of munitions and credits for one set of combatants. Is that neutrality? If that does not lead us straight to the yawning hell of war, I do not know what would.

But I repeat that this is not a political question. It is a great human question, touching the very heart of the humanities. Have we so far forgotten our Christian teachings that we are willing to furnish the instruments of mass murder of innocent women and children who have committed no offense and whose misfortune it is that they have been doomed by a cruel fate to the merciless domination of a godless dictator? Think how thrilled we will be when we read in the dispatches about the devastating work done by a squadron of bombing planes "over there," with an estimate of the number of women and children killed and maimed and the vast destruction to property, concluding with the information that "these planes came from America." Or when we read a heart-rending account of the strangulation of boys by poison gas, with the concluding information that "this gas was made in Pittsburgh." Oh, what has become of our Christianity?

If we repeal the arms embargo, we will be saying in effect to Britain and France: "Move over. We want to be your partner in this war."

A vote to repeal the embargo would be half a vote for war. I have pledged my sacred honor that I will not vote to send our boys into a bloody war overseas, and I will not cast half a vote to send them in. With me a pledge is a pledge, and I will redeem that pledge if I stand alone. [Applause.] Repealing the embargo would put us in the war immediately, in the role of a noncombatant ally of one set of fighting powers, and our role would be likely to change with kaleidoscopic suddenness at any minute to that of a combatant, as the pressures are applied, and the exigencies of the war situation develop. Furthermore, if we let down the munitions floodgates to furnish the lethal instruments of destruction on credit, instead of for cash, as proposed, it will not be long until the Allies will be running their war on American money.

A tourist returning from abroad told me that he did not see a smile in all of Europe.

Before we vote ourselves into the war let us think of the tramp, tramp, tramp of marching armies; of the pall that hangs over every household in Europe; of the fear that grips every heart as men are regimented and sent away to die. Then let us contrast that sad and gloomy and forbidding picture with the happiness and freedom which we enjoy under the American flag. I pray to God that we will not by any ill-considered action transform our land into what their land is today.

From out of the background of history Washington and Jefferson point the way in this crucial hour, admonishing us that we should keep America forever out of Europe and Europe forever out of the Western Hemisphere. If we catch the inspiration of their wisdom and follow their advice, America will be the main hope for the creation of a new and better world out of the ashes of carnage, and will endure forever as the great sanctuary and citadel of human freedom. [Applause.]

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow, after the reading of the Journal and any special orders, I may address this House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Alabama?

There was no objection.

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on three

different subjects, and to include, first, a statement by the Secretary of the General Welfare Federation in my own home district; second, an editorial by the editor of the Los Angeles Evening News; and, third, a radio broadcast on Hispanic-American Culture by the Librarian of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. FRIES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks and include therein, at the request of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BARRY], two letters which he has written to his constituency explaining his position on the neutrality question.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the request is granted. There was no objection.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. DARROW (at the request of Mr. DITTER), indefinitely on account of illness.

#### THANKSGIVING DAY

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 30 seconds.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CASE of South Dakota. Mr. Speaker, on the 2d of October I introduced a bill (H. R. 7556) to make the last Thursday in November of each year a legal holiday—Thanksgiving Day. In view of the fact that if action is not taken at this special session it will be too late for consideration before the pending Thanksgiving, I would like to ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is a matter that has been referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, which committee has not considered it. It has been considered by no other committee, and therefore I feel constrained to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects to the request.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RAYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 12 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, October 17, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

1104. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV a letter from the Acting Postmaster General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to reform the lease for the Sellwood station of the Portland, Oreg., post office, was taken from the Speaker's table and referred to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

#### PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BUCKLEY of New York:

H. R. 7586. A bill for the relief of Franc Natko, his wife, Margaret Natko, and their infant child, Margaret Natko; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. FAY:

H. R. 7587. A bill for the relief of Ramon Fraguas Gonzalez, also known as Jose Gonzalez, also known as Ramon Gonzalez; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

5782. By Mr. FENTON: Petition of the Reverend Francis W. Suretek and members of the Polish-American Citizens Association of Schuylkill County, Pa., requesting repeal of the arms embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5783. Also, petition of the Sunbury Unit, Veterans' Welfare League of Northumberland County, Pa., requesting repeal of the Neutrality Act and substitution of a cash-and-carry system, keeping one great thing in mind—America shall not go to war; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5784. Also, petition of the Schuylkill Classis (Schuylkill County, Pa.) Ministerium of the Evangelical and Reformed Church, requesting retention of the arms-embargo provision of the Neutrality Act; to write back into that law all needful cash-and-carry clauses and controls; for peace, to preserve, to maintain, and to promote peace; to utilize all established constitutional, ordinary, and extraordinary prerogatives to their full capacity of American statesmanship for the furtherance of peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5785. Also, petition of F. S. Vogelsang and other citizens of Pottsville, Palo Alto, Port Carbon, and Minersville, Pa., to keep the present Neutrality Act intact; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5786. Also, petition of Louis F. Pounder and other citizens of Gordon, Ashland, Fountain Springs, Girardville, Locust Dale, and Ashland, Pa., requesting to have the arms-embargo provision of the present Neutrality Act retained, and to provide strict cash and carry for all other commodities; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5787. Also, petition of the Reverend W. I. Shambaugh, First Evangelical Church of Milton, Pa., and other citizens, to keep America out of Europe's war by avoiding foreign entanglements; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5788. Also, petition of Washington Camp, No. 134, Patriotic Order Sons of America, Port Carbon, Pa., opposing any change in the Neutrality Act, but if a change must be made it be strictly cash-and-carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5789. Also, petition of Lincoln Post, No. 73, American Legion, Shamokin, Pa., requesting strict neutrality, and opposing any action that might involve this country in any foreign war; urging that Army and Navy be built strong enough to defend the United States against invasion; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5790. By Mr. GILLIE: Petition of H. J. Gerhardtstein and 400 other citizens of Fort Wayne and New Haven, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5791. Also, resolution of the Allen County Republican Labor Club, Fort Wayne, Ind., opposing repeal of the arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5792. Also, resolution of the Fort Wayne Chamber of Commerce, urging the United States to maintain a fair, impartial, and lasting peace; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5793. By Mr. KRAMER: Resolution adopted by the West Los Angeles Democratic Club, No. 1, to prevent profiteering and demanding that laws be made with adequate penalties applied and enforced to bring prices back to the normal standard and at no time shall they raise unless wages are increased at the same ratio; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

5794. By Mr. McCORMACK: Petition of Edward C. Dullea, of Dorchester, Mass., and 76 others, opposing any change in present neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5795. Also, petition of M. A. Albisser, of Roxbury, Mass., and 35 others, advocating retention of present arms embargo; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5796. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Charles H. Hawkins and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5797. Also, petition of Herbert Stobb and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., urging no change in the neutrality law and no cash and carry; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5798. Also, petition of John Kain and other citizens of Wheeling, W. Va., opposing any change in the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5799. Also, petition of citizenship chairman, Mountain State Farm Women's Club, Roneys Point, W. Va., urging that we oppose repealing of the neutrality law; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5800. By Mr. SCHAFER of Michigan: Resolution of the Grand Lodge (Mich.) Lodge, No. 179, Free and Accepted Masons, opposing any changes in the present neutrality law, and requesting that arms embargo be retained; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

5801. By the SPEAKER: Petition of Polish Falcons of America, of Pittsburgh, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the newly established Polish Government; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, OCTOBER 17, 1939

(Legislative day of Wednesday, October 4, 1939)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock meridian, on the expiration of the recess.

The Chaplain, Rev. Zebarny T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Father of Mercies, almighty and most tender God, who hast promised to those who seek Thee with all their heart that, as far as the east is from the west, so far wilt Thou remove their transgressions from them, and that, like as a father pitieth his own children, so is the Lord merciful to them that fear Him: We pray for the daily renewal of the spirit of true joy which the sense of Thy abiding presence alone can give, and for a steadfast heart to meet with constant cheerfulness the anxieties and trials of our life, that joy and trial alike may be sanctified to us as we yield ourselves—spirit, soul, and body—to the fulfillment of our sacred duty to our God, our Nation, and the world. Grant unto us, unworthy though we be, a clear vision of the beauty of holiness and a sure confidence in Him who is the strong Son of God, immortal love, even Jesus Christ, our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, October 16, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Colo.	Reed
Andrews	Davis	King	Reynolds
Austin	Donahey	La Follette	Russell
Bailey	Downey	Lee	Schwartz
Bankhead	Ellender	Lodge	Schwellenbach
Barbour	Frazier	Lucas	Sheppard
Barkley	George	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bilbo	Gibson	McCarran	Slattery
Borah	Gillette	McKellar	Smathers
Bridges	Green	McNary	Stewart
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Taft
Bulow	Gurney	Miller	Thomas, Okla.
Burke	Hale	Minton	Thomas, Utah
Byrd	Harrison	Murray	Townsend
Byrnes	Hatch	Neely	Truman
Capper	Hayden	Norris	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Nye	Van Nuys
Chandler	Hill	O'Mahoney	Wagner
Chavez	Holman	Overton	Walsh
Clark, Idaho	Holt	Pepper	Wheeler
Clark, Mo.	Hughes	Pittman	Wiley
Connally	Johnson, Calif.	Radcliffe	

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Washington [Mr. BONE], the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS], and the Senator from Maryland [Mr. TYDINGS] are detained from the Senate because of illness.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is absent because of illness in his family.

The Senator from New York [Mr. MEAD] and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are unavoidably detained.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Eighty-seven Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE CIVIL-SERVICE SYSTEM

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed the Senator from Missouri [Mr. TRUMAN] a member of the Special Committee to Investigate the Administration and Operation of the Civil